

fast as the Soviets can make it so," and they are building to the point where "it will be impossible to get them out with conventional weapons."

KEATING said the arms shipment reached Cuba the day after President Kennedy told his news conference last Thursday that Cuba is being kept under daily surveillance and that only one ship with possibly military cargo has docked there since October.

A Defense Department spokesman said: "Within a few days of the President's press conference last week two large Soviet ships,

Kasimov and Baltica, did arrive in Cuba. There is no evidence that either carried offensive weapons."

As to KEATING's statement that the Soviets are continuing to maintain the missile sites they agreed to dismantle, the Pentagon spokesman said:

"Concrete launch pads were broken up and other parts of the installations were destroyed. There is no evidence that these sites are usable, that they are being used for any military purpose, or that they are being maintained."

The spokesman said also that after the agreement between Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and President Kennedy for removal of offensive weapons it was observed that the missile sites in Cuba were being dismantled.

"Missiles, transporters and missile erectors were photographed en route to and at port areas, being loaded aboard ship, and aboard ships en route to the U.S.S.R.," he said.

RENO J. CONTI,
Foreign Affairs Division.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 5: 9: For the fruit of the spirit is found in all that is good and right and true.

Eternal and ever-blessed God, inspire us to meet the duties and responsibilities of this day with a mastery and a majesty bearing unmistakable testimony that we have a radiant faith which reflects Thy greatness and glory.

We humbly acknowledge that there are times when all life seems to present a withering and wintry aspect and the days are drab and dreary.

Grant that in this Lenten season our souls may experience a glorious springtime when Thy gracious spirit shall lay hold on us with a blossoming fragrance and a fertilizing power to bring forth the fruits of goodness, righteousness, and truth.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as not answering rollcall No. 9 on yesterday. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, may sit during general debate for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SLIPPAGE IN THE RS-70 PROGRAM

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday while in the Committee of the Whole in the debate on the bill that is presently pending before the House on aircraft, missiles, and ships, I inadvertently made an error in a response to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] in respect to the cost of the slippage of the present B-70, RS-70 program.

Mr. Speaker, I have corrected that RECORD, and it appears on page 4016 of yesterday's RECORD. I have corrected it to show that the actual slippage costs are presently from \$15 million to \$20 million.

This figure is based upon a ratio of increased cost to the increased time. The actual amounts involved are the already authorized \$171 million, plus \$36 million which have recently been released by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to note this correction.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

UNESCO BOOKLET, "EQUALITY OF RIGHTS BETWEEN RACES AND NATIONALITIES IN THE U.S.S.R."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 and again yesterday I commented on my inability to obtain a copy of the infamous UNESCO booklet, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R."

In view of my previous comments, I now wish to announce that a copy of this booklet was delivered to my office yesterday afternoon with the compliments of Frederick G. Dutton, an Assistant Secretary of State. I have written Mr. Dutton to express my appreciation for his courtesy.

Quite frankly, I had not contacted the State Department since I was led to believe that no copies were available in Washington for distribution, except on loan from the Library of Congress. If he has an additional copy, perhaps Mr. Dutton will want to pass it along to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, who informed me in a letter dated March 4 that he had "not been able to lay hold of one myself."

TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM CHARLES DOHERTY, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO JAMAICA

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, recently I was in Jamaica and I had the pleasant opportunity of again meeting with the Hon. William Charles Doherty, the Ambassador of the United States of America, whom I had known for many years here in the city of Washington. He is still the same wonderful friend and it was good to see at first hand what a magnificent job he is doing in representing our country so ably. In my meanderings through Kingston, and because as a man in public life I was especially interested, I often stopped and asked the people whom I met just what they thought of our new Ambassador. Regardless of how humble or important the persons were, they knew him and they loved him.

Before his nomination to this diplomatic post, Bill Doherty was the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers—a career that lasted 20 years.

He become one of the most effective voices organized labor has ever had in promoting democracy and the American way of life among the trade unions of the free world. Not only was he a distinguished president of a great and respected union, he was also a most compelling advocate of the free enterprise system among the troubled peoples of Europe and Latin America. He exemplified the people-to-people approach in creating good will for the United States of America in those areas where this country was least strong. While he was still president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, two Presidents—of opposite political philosophies—called upon Bill Doherty's experience and know-how in the international field. President Eisenhower selected him for a special mission in Brazil; President Kennedy selected him to represent him at the famous economic conference at Punta del Este in Uruguay, and also to join Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON at the independence celebrations in Jamaica in 1962.

When Bill Doherty resigned from the position of president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, President Kennedy almost immediately tapped him for one of the most sensitive and difficult diplomatic jobs in this hemisphere—our first Ambassador to the new nation of Jamaica. The choice was both brilliant and inspired. As the first representative of organized labor ever to attain the ambassadorial rank, Bill Doherty was going to a nation in which both dominant political parties are labor parties. President Bustamante is a veteran labor leader himself—and so are the chiefs of the opposition party.

Almost as soon as he arrived, Ambassador Doherty became known to Jamaicans as "Ambassador Bill." He has been enthusiastically received and unanimously respected by those with whom he has come in contact. His is one of the great success stories in modern diplomacy, and every one in this body who knew Bill Doherty when he was doing such a grand job in representing the letter carriers of the nation will rejoice to know that he is doing an equally fine job in representing his country in this important diplomatic field. I note from the RECORD that the U.S. Senate yesterday confirmed his appointment and that this augurs well for the United States of America.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]		
Baring	Daddario	Dowdy
Celler	Davis, Tenn.	Griffiths
Clausen	Diggs	Harvey, Ind.

Healey	Miller, N.Y.	Smith, Va.
Kee	Nix	Steed
McClory	O'Brien, Ill.	Stubblefield
McDade	Patten	Teague, Tex.
Madden	Powell	Tupper
Marsh	Rains	Walter
Matthews	Riehlman	
Michel	Rivers, Alaska	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 403 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 2440, with Mr. SHELLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] had 48 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] had 1 hour and 29 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this morning I would like to discuss three things which I consider to be of major importance in our military system today. They are the Polaris submarine, antisubmarine warfare, and airlifts.

Mr. Chairman, I also plan to discuss the condition of our continental defenses in this country and touch on what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] said about fat in the defense budget, particularly this budget that we are presenting. If time allows, I intend to discuss the RS-70 and try to put in proper perspective some of the things that were discussed on yesterday.

POLARIS

The first of these is Polaris. Polaris, the Navy's fleet ballistic missile weapon system, has been operational for over 2 years. Since U.S.S. *George Washington* (SSBN-598) sailed from Charleston, S.C., on November 15, 1960, Polaris missiles have been at sea. Constantly ready for launch within minutes of receiving the command, this concealed, yet mobile force—in being—has made a contribution, beyond reckoning, to a stable world peace. The tremendous advantages of ballistic missiles, deployed in nuclear powered submarines, have been readily grasped by the peoples of all nations. As a result, Polaris is accepted as essential to our free world strategic posture.

Soon after U.S.S. *George Washington's* pioneer deployment, she was joined by four nuclear submarines of the same class, armed with the 1,200-nautical-mile Polaris A-1 missiles. Four additional SSBN's of the larger, more powerful *Ethan Allen* class have since sailed for patrol operations, carrying the improved, 1,500-nautical-mile-range Polaris A-2 missile.

These first 9 submarines are, of course, but the vanguard of the Polaris force of 41 SSBN's, now building or planned. A still larger, more efficient class of FBM submarines will soon be operational. The *Lafayette*, launched in May of last year, will soon be ready for sea—the forerunner of a new class of nuclear submarines, larger than some World War II cruisers. Designed to incorporate recent improvements in both the submarine vehicle and in missile subsystems, these ships are about 425 feet long and displace some 7,000 tons. They will be ready to accept the third generation 2,500-nautical-mile-range Polaris A-3 missile. Every important target on the face of the earth will be within striking range of this seaborne projection of national power.

Still, research and development actively continues. Now in flight test at Cape Canaveral, the Polaris A-3 is scheduled to be ready in mid-1964 for later operational *Lafayette*-class submarines. Through extension of earlier Polaris technology, the A-3 is larger, and will be more powerful in its destructive potential. It incorporates many advances, including a new inertial guidance system, the smallest and lightest yet devised for U.S. ballistic missiles. Fully successful flights were achieved in February of this year.

With respect to the currently approved program, the major development effort of the FBM—Polaris—system will be completed during fiscal 1963. Development of a lighter, more efficient steam ejection launching system is nearing completion; improvement of missile accuracy through navigational means is being explored; and further development of techniques to enhance the penetration capability of Polaris missiles against defended targets is being pursued.

It is a source of pride to me, to the Navy, and, I am sure, to all Americans, that this magnificent weapon system has been created so quickly and successfully.

Complementing all other elements of our national military strength, it may be emphasized that these submerged, mobile, missile-launching bases are on patrol for peace.

Someone has talked about fat in this budget. Where and how would we have gotten the A-1, the A-2, and the A-3 if we did not have research and development? This brings me to the statement that without research and development, which is something you cannot even imagine or conjecture, you would have none of these things. Look at the heartaches that went on with Admiral Raborn in the days of his very austere budget in the development of the Polaris system. Had he failed, everybody would have criticized him. But the admiral never gave up even with such an austere and marginal budget as he had.

Now it has come true. It is the greatest thing we have in our arsenal today, barring none.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE PROGRAMS

I know that it is unnecessary for me to tell this House that antisubmarine warfare is one of the most important and complex functions for which the Navy is responsible. It cuts across all lines of Navy endeavor. It is a team effort with surface, air and subsurface forces all contributing their share.

The Navy's antisubmarine warfare capability improved during the last year. The new P-3A Orion patrol plane was introduced into the fleet and is replacing the old Neptunes. A new fixed-wing airplane, the Tracker, has started to replace the older planes on the antisubmarine warfare carrier. The same is true for the antisubmarine warfare helicopter carried aboard the CVS. The Dash, the new drone antisubmarine warfare helicopter, has joined the fleet to give the destroyer a long-range kill capability to match the new longer range sound detectors. New sonars and weapons reached the fleets in increasing numbers. Some of these new forces and equipments were used last October during the Cuban crisis to excellent advantage. They clearly demonstrated that the antisubmarine warfare road the Navy is traveling is pointed in the right direction.

Detection and identification of the submarine below the surface of the sea is still the major problem in antisubmarine warfare. Acoustics, the propagation of sound waves in water, is still the limiting factor. As long as this remains true, improvement will be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. The Navy, therefore, is continuing to increase its efforts in the field of oceanography—studying the environment of antisubmarine warfare. While we all hope for a major scientific breakthrough in the field of submarine detection, none is in sight now. Not that the Navy is leaving any stone unturned. Other methods and phenomena are being actively explored if they show any signs of promise at all.

The Navy is not doing this alone in an ivory tower. They are in close partnership with industry and the leading scientists of the country. Such organizations as the National Security Industrial Association, the Institute of Aerospace Sciences, and the National Academy of Sciences, to name a few. All have committees or people actively studying Navy antisubmarine warfare problems. With this team effort every promising avenue of approach should be covered.

The program presented this year is a sound one and should increase our Navy's antisubmarine warfare readiness and capability. Fifty percent of this year's shipbuilding program is for antisubmarine warfare ships. Nearly 25 percent of the Navy's research and development program will be in the field of antisubmarine warfare. As a matter of fact, more than 25 percent of the Navy's total procurement budget is devoted directly to antisubmarine warfare.

The shipbuilding and conversion program contains new destroyer escorts and

nuclear submarines as well as modernization for some of the older ships. Further procurement of the new aircraft that I referred to, as well as modern equipment and weapons, will enhance and strengthen our antisubmarine warfare posture. Increased research and development effort will assist us to maintain that posture.

I am pleased that the Navy is stressing this important function to counter the large submarine threat that faces us. I do not want to give the impression that the Navy has solved all of its antisubmarine warfare problems or that everything is rosy. It is still a difficult and demanding problem, but I am confident that the Navy is making every effort to keep ahead of the submarine threat and that they will succeed in doing so.

We had to raise this budget. If we had done justice to the military we would have raised it more than we did. Did you know that we do not have in our arsenal today what you could call a truly modern fighter aircraft for our defenses over the F-4H made in the great State of Missouri at the McDonnell aircraft factory? We all know that we need the ablest fighter on earth implementing the other defenses we have to give us the type of defense we need.

You have heard about the TFX. We hope that from the TFX will come a modern fighter; but as you know such a plane has a comparatively short life, assuming there is no slippage. When you get sophisticated weapons systems such as we have in the RS-70—and we need the RS-70—you are bound to have slippage here and slippage there. This is the state of the art.

We hear about cutting this budget and cutting out the fat, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said. Of course, we join in this. We have the Hébert committee now that is going to be chaired by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. Last year we brought back to the Treasury of the United States over \$40 million in contracts that were changed. It happens in all administrations, the past administration was no exception. When you have a new weapon you cannot have competitive bidding, certainly; this is impossible. Our distinguished chairman beats it into our heads every day, day in and day out: Wherever possible have competitive bidding. But this does not assure you of a firm price on an implement of warfare. Let me tell you something, war is wasteful, war is designed to kill. If war is waste, the preparation for war likewise is wasteful, and we point this out.

AIRLIFT

I have had a long and abiding interest in the question of airlift and have, I hope, contributed to the greatly improved position in which the country now finds itself in this important area.

Many of us are familiar with the old C-119 which, although specifically designed for airborne operations, is small and slow and has a short range. We will continue to use these old C-119's as part of our reserve, but I am pleased to inform the House that we are now going to acquire several additional squads of C-130E's which are much faster, much

more efficient, and to a much greater extent fulfill our true requirements in the airlift area.

As these C-130's come into our inventory, they will replace an equal number of C-124's. The C-124 also is a useful aircraft and can be used quite efficiently for strategic airlift but it is not a suitable airplane for airdrop operations.

The C-123 assault transport had been planned for phasing out during fiscal year 1964. However, it has been found to be very useful in Vietnam because of its ability to take off on very short runways and similarly to land in restricted areas. Because of these capabilities, it is planned to keep them in the inventory for the time being.

The C-141 which is our newest aircraft in the airlift area is proceeding satisfactorily and we will soon see this airplane in production.

The C-141 will be able to replace our C-133 for many of the outsize items which only the C-133 can carry today.

All in all, I am happy to report that our airlift situation is vastly improved over that which we viewed so unhappily a few short years ago.

In the world today, while it is difficult to set one military capability above another, whatever order of priority might be used, airlift would be very close to the top of any such list.

The bill that we have before us today contains among other things authority for the procurement of the C-130E turboprop transport and the C-141 transport. The passage of the bill will be another step toward the enhancement of our capabilities in the area of airlift.

I trust that this bill will be passed in the same fashion as our bill of last year, and that is to say, unanimously.

We have \$135 million for two more nuclear-powered submarines and \$363 million for the RS-70. These figures ought to stand. At the proper time I expect to take more time to refer to the RS-70, but time does not permit me to do that now.

There is another area which should have your attention. By the simple expedient of arithmetic your fleet is going out of business over a period of years by block obsolescence of the fleet—the U.S. Navy. I include a part of a report Mr. BATES, Mr. HARDY, and I made on this subject:

VESSEL OBSOLESCENCE

There is a very real likelihood, indeed almost mathematical certainly, that our active fleet will encounter such serious block obsolescence in years to come as to raise a serious question as to its ability to perform its assigned missions.

With this in mind a special subcommittee was appointed in the fall of last year to look into this matter and make recommendations to the full committee. The subcommittee held hearings and issued a report which only fortified the belief already held by the committee that block obsolescence constituted a major threat to our naval power. The subcommittee in its report reduced its findings to an arithmetical formula which is unavoidable in its conclusion.

A portion of this report is set out below. The conclusions reached are concurred in by the full committee:

"SUBCOMMITTEE FINDINGS

"Today there are 860 ships in our active fleet. Of this number 598 were authorized

during World War II. The average age of all of the ships in the active fleet is 15 years. Based on past experience a Navy ship may be expected to have an average useful life of about 20 years.

"The active fleet planned for 1973 contemplates approximately this same number of ships (although the composition of the fleet by type will be substantially changed).

"As indicated on the chart set out in the report, 387 ships were authorized between fiscal years 1948 and 1963. This is an average of 24 ships were year.

"To approach the problem arithmetically, one need but take the average number of ships constructed each year from fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1963 (24 ships), multiply this by the number of years between 1963 and 1970 (7 years), and add to this result the number 355 which represents the number of ships presently in being or authorized which can be considered as assets in 1973 and the formula looks like this:

$$24 \times 7 = 168 + 355 = 503$$

"This means that the 860 ships in our active fleet today will decline to 503 ships 10 years hence.

"This is simple arithmetic. The result is inevitable and unarguable.

"But, one would immediately contend, no one is going to let this come about. Or, in the parlance of the recent past, 'It can't happen here.' But it can. True, the fiscal year 1962 program was 36 ships and the fiscal year 1963 program was 37 ships, well above the 24-ship average. Then let us substitute 37 for the 24 in the formula and see what is the result. The formula now would be:

$$37 \times 7 = 259 + 355 = 594$$

"Under a shipbuilding program of this size the fleet would decline from 860 to 594, still very short of the year 1973 requirements.

"What is the answer? A simple one: We must substitute the figure 70 for the figure 24 or 37 and by so doing our fleet in 1973 will approximate the size of today's fleet. There is no other way."

In last year's bill there were 37 new ships requested. In this year's bill 41 new ships were requested and the committee added 2 more for a total of 43. It is obvious that this level of shipbuilding must be increased in the future in order to preserve the naval power of the United States. The committee urges the Department of Defense to give this matter its closest and most serious consideration.

We are bringing to you 41 new ships this year. These are not enough. We ought to have 50 plus, 60 plus, and possibly 70 over the next 6 or 7 years.

Look at some of these figures I have in my report. We have brought you only 41 ships. We have now 335 ships built within the last 15 years. This, plus 24 a year, which we are now building, gives us 503 ships. We have 860 in our inventory. Only 503 of them are not obsolete or in various categories of being modern. The life of a ship is only 20 years. If you take a ship and FRAM it—that is bringing it up to date by fleet repair and modernization—you cannot modernize a ship any more than you can bring it up to the point it was in before.

We have missiles and missiles requiring air conditioning. You cannot put that into a hull. You can only FRAM it so much.

These submarines are getting more and more obsolete every day. If we brought in a budget that did justice to this country, it would far exceed the \$15 billion we are bringing to you today. We have brought to you an austere budget. You can holler about economy all you want, but I say cut your budget somewhere else, do not take it out of the hide of your military because you cannot afford to do it. And I challenge anybody to find the fat in this bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to the gentleman that he is making a very fine, a very constructive statement. There is not a man in this House who served in World War II who does not remember the problems that the men in the battle-line had because of the need for modernization of the weapon system, because we were unprepared. If we are unprepared when the time comes, if it should come, we would suffer in a manner that would be irreparable. I compliment the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman who is now speaking, for presenting to this Congress an absolutely minimum budget. I am completely convinced, although the gentleman may not get to the RS-70 problem, after reading the testimony of the committee there is no question in my mind but that it would be foolhardy if we do not adopt the committee's recommendations.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman very much.

Now, I would like to say this: Modern warfare is an expensive thing. Did you know that your Army was neglected for year upon year upon year and that we are just now getting to the point where we are modernizing our Army? Ask the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. He knows. He is on the Committee on Appropriations. Ask him if there is any fat in the Army budget. The Army has been marching, literally, on half soles. We are just now in this budget bringing the Army up to the point of modernity.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot cut this budget. Take our airlift, for instance. We will have to spend over a billion dollars to modernize our airlift. Our airlift had been neglected for years. Our airlift was almost nonexistent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina. The great need at this time for research and development funds in order to improve our anti-submarine forces cannot be stressed too strongly. The fact that 25 percent of the shipbuilding funds will be directed toward research and development indicates that our Navy is not standing still and is traveling in a direction that

will give this Nation a fast hard-hitting force that will be able to deal with the threat of the Soviet submarines.

Forty-one new Navy vessels are included in this authorization, also 35 conversion vessels.

It is important that our Navy construct ships that can travel faster than the present new merchant ships that are breaking all records for ocean travel. We must build ships of increased cruising range. We must develop and design antisubmarine warfare vessels that can meet the test of speed, maneuverability, lower cost in construction, and lower cost of operation. This I believe can be done with the technical know-how in our private shipbuilding industry as well as in our Bureau of Ships.

At the present time some of our shipyards are losing some of the best brains in new ideas for modern shipbuilding. I hope our Government realizes that private shipyards who have the brains and the know-how cannot always continue if every ship is going to be awarded on the lowest bidder basis. While this system may seem to be saving the taxpayer some money, the truth of the matter is that it is serving to discourage private shipbuilding industry from coming up with new ideas, and we could very well digress into having a second-class Navy. We must encourage initiative; we must recognize the ability of private enterprise to come up with new methods that can improve our Navy. The so-called statement of sharpening the pencil could very well be one of the costliest errors ever made. Let us start to amend the ways of the past few years by building the very best in quality, the very best in endurance, and the type of Navy that can meet the challenge of the day.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense of our Nation is certainly an objective of highest priority. The legislation we are debating today represents our current response to this obligation. The answer is truly bipartisan, reported out of our committee by unanimous vote. It reflects the detailed study and evaluation of our Secretary of Defense, our military leaders and Service Secretaries, as well as the Armed Services Committee. The bill did not evolve in an atmosphere of complete agreement. Differences do exist respecting the emphasis to be placed upon certain weapon systems. Most of our committee have doubted the wisdom of the decision of the Defense Department to halt production of the strategic manned bomber, thus indicating our ultimate reliance on missiles. Thirty-two members, of whom I am one, view with deepest concern the continued development of the bomber by the Soviets and can foresee a true gap in this threat by the end of the sixties. Accordingly, we have been unhappy over the foot dragging by the Defense Department in the development and construction of the RS-70.

Proper evaluation of weapons is most difficult in this age of rapid technological progress. The breakthroughs have been so numerous and so far reaching that we

¹ The ships that would comprise the fleet in 1973 would have to be authorized and appropriated for by 1970. A 3-year leadtime is required between the date a ship is authorized and the date it joins the fleet.

² Testimony indicated that barring unforeseen, unpredictable technological breakthroughs, the Navy will have 335 ships, presently in being or authorized, that can be considered as assets in 1973.

do not discount the possibilities of witnessing even more startling advances—it is safer to discuss when than if. Therefore, I doubt whether any talent, no matter how real, any experience, no matter how extensive, any analysis, no matter how penetrating, should arbitrarily pronounce a death sentence for a weapons system as flexible as the manned bomber. Likewise we should not be deterred by difficulties or failures. The facts are that we have now solved so many of the problems attending supersonic flight that success is in sight.

In our planning we are troubled by the rapid tempo of obsolescence which threatens the validity of weapons systems even before they can be transferred from the drawing board to the production line. Also, we are faced with equally rapid changes in political, geographic, and strategic balances. We can count on scarcely a single factor to maintain such a status quo as to provide cornerstone reliability. So, the simple truth is that we must be prepared to defend our rights, which are, in essence, the rights of the free world, anywhere, any time and in any way.

We have learned the hard way that aggression anywhere is aggression against us. When Secretary of State Stimson sounded this alarm over 30 years ago at the time Manchuria was attacked, we ignored his warning until aggression became a repeated process culminating in World War II.

As a result, we should have learned that the only way to check aggression is to respond in a timely and effective way to each such threat as it arises. To do so requires a force that is in being and not on the drawing boards. To achieve this concept of instant capability has been the goal of your committee. We would provide weapons and manpower of sufficient strength and mobility, so strategically located as to insure prompt and decisive responses. With this objective in view, we have analyzed manning levels, weapons inventories, and transport capabilities in the light of today's threats. In scanning the zones of potential trouble, it is somewhat depressing to note how little of the world is truly at peace. Danger signals are flying in countless areas and in many of them the United States provides virtually the sole protective force of any consequence.

Responsibilities of such vast proportions entail monetary costs of disturbing size. The burden of expense can threaten the stability of our economy, hence, our ability to survive. The continuing attack on our way of life is as much political and economic as it is military. Therefore, we must keep our defense cost in balance. It is true that military pressure provides the more vivid and spectacular danger but the power of other techniques must never be underestimated. Accordingly, in programming the defense activities for fiscal year 1964, every effort has been made by your committee to insure the security we need at a cost we can accept.

Our distinguished chairman has ably outlined the vast scope of the military procurement necessary to meet our national responsibilities. He has made it

abundantly clear that, in general, the committee acted upon the recommendations of the Defense Department in allocating funds for the several types of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. Our action is at variance with the Secretary's request in two instances. First, we have included in the bill an authorization for two additional attack nuclear submarines, believing such action to be prudent and imperative. Secondly, we have increased funds for the development of the RS-70. The majority of our committee have been disturbed over the increased emphasis of the Department of Defense on missiles, with less and less on manned strategic systems. The last Congress shared this concern and acting upon the military judgment available to it, urged the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the development of the RS-70 as rapidly as possible and appropriated funds so to do. The opposition of the Secretary to this program, so evident at that time, continues. His conviction is no doubt sincere. Equally sincere is the attitude of the 32 members of our committee who differ with him. This disagreement in no way reflects lack of confidence in the overall capability of the Secretary. Rather does it suggest acceptance of committee responsibility instead of rubberstamp approval. This is as it should be. We have on our committee many members who have served long in their assignment, participating in defense planning during the most critical years of our history. They have seen the evolution of modern warfare firsthand and also, through the eyes of our greatest military leaders for whom a real respect has been developed.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from New York, and my colleague on the Committee on Armed Services, could tell us why the previous administration, the Eisenhower administration, did not use this money for the then B-70 program.

Mr. PIRNIE. I could only speak for the time with which I am reasonably familiar. Perhaps the state of research in any given time period may have had some bearing on it. But whether it was in the last administration or this administration, would make no difference to me. If the military leaders, those with whom we place such responsibility, say that this weapons system has value and should be advanced, then I am accepting their advice.

Mr. COHELAN. But as the gentleman recognizes, we are not arguing the question of whether or not we go forward with the B-70, RS-70 program. We in fact have such a program at the present time, as the gentleman well knows. The question is, Should we proceed with two additional aircraft in this program, and for what purpose? Is any value added in going forward with such a program?

Mr. PIRNIE. I believe the gentleman knows the capabilities that are to be included in the fourth and the fifth planes, and he also knows the difference between the third and the other two.

Those capabilities, many of which are classified, have to do with making the plane a weapons system. That is the difference, is it not?

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman well knows that as far as the weapons system is concerned there is some doubt about whether this kind of project would ever in any sense become a weapons system. As the gentleman recalls from the testimony in our hearings, Admiral Anderson testified in a colloquy with me that his major interest in the program was strictly research and development for reconnaissance purposes.

Mr. PIRNIE. These members lay no claim to military genius, nor do they seek the role of the armchair strategist, but they do feel concern when the development of a weapon of such potential as the RS-70 is urged by virtually unanimous action of our military leaders and such recommendation is brushed aside. They and I have confidence in our men in uniform, particularly our several Chiefs of Staff.

In this world of fast-moving technology the effectiveness of weapons and of defenses can change from day to day. We cannot wait for the ultimate. We must have in being our most effective concept in each important category.

Let us consider the potential of the RS-70 as we understand it to be. This plane would have the capability of travel at three times the speed of sound for long distances and at high altitudes, in a hostile environment either on reconnaissance or striking missions. While so engaged, it would report back the results of its own strikes or those of other weapons systems. The effect of this new threat on the current Soviet air defense system would be tremendous. Present Soviet interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles would become practically worthless, permitting penetration. As indicated in our report, the very existence of this threat would require the Soviets to extend their air defense system at a cost of not less than \$10 billion before they would have any reasonable possibility of coping with the RS-70 weapon system. If we do not develop this threat, we are simplifying the defense problems for the Soviet.

However, it should be made clear that if the program is limited to the three prototypes presently planned, the supporting systems necessary to make a weapons system out of the RS-70 would not be developed. Hence, the full impact on the Soviet defense system would never materialize.

Our investment in the RS-70 program is far more than a bet on the effectiveness of a manned bomber as an offensive weapon. It represents our basic study and development of supersonic transport. All of the difficult problems which had to be solved in its construction are landmarks in the evolution of air or space travel. For example, we have developed structures, fuels, bearings, lubrication, and tires to meet the terrific temperature changes incident to such stresses and speeds. Each prototype has contained more instrumentation and greater capabilities. Planes 4 and 5, which we would authorize, embody highly

classified and effective command and control systems with weapons keyed to radar capabilities which only a short time ago were termed impossible to achieve.

Our military advisers, who have urged development of the RS-70 with all possible speed, are concerned that the successful evolution of an effective anti-missile missile will make our failure to retain a proper mix of weapons very critical indeed. Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky recently said:

I maintain that for any predictable time the manned vehicle, whether airborne, spaceborne or orbital that can maneuver in and out of orbit will be the decisive weapon in any future war.

His statement and the attitude of our military leaders clearly emphasize that foot dragging in the development of the fullest capabilities of supersonic aircraft can upset the proper striking balance of ballistic missiles and aircraft and can be a dangerous mistake. It is not necessary or wise to take this risk.

We are cost conscious. We do not wish to expend a dollar that is not necessary, but we do feel that the present investment in the RS-70 is so great and its ultimate potential so vital, that it should not be sidetracked until its feasibility as a weapons system is established or disproved. A half-hearted effort will not provide the proper answer.

We are mindful of the size of the expenditure involved in this bill. It represents \$85 for every man, woman and child in the United States. The burden of such spending at a time when we are not in an all-out conflict is unprecedented. Yet the cost in dollars is more easily absorbed than the cost in blood if our guard is lowered too far. Our force in being is designed to deter attack upon our Nation and we are convinced that it is serving its purpose well.

We have been assured that our known military strength and our display of force at the time of the Cuban crisis disrupted the Soviet timetable. If so, the additional resources provided in this bill should strengthen further our resolve to deal decisively with all threats to the peace of the world, particularly those in this hemisphere. We are reminded that a significant move of a single ship of our 7th Fleet has on occasions eased critical Asiatic situations. In time of crisis, we must have at our command an alert, well-trained force, properly deployed and equipped with modern arms. This type of security we can and must have. No longer can we rely upon a warning period within which to arm. Only a capability to respond quickly and powerfully will deter the aggressor.

Yes, the stakes are high and so is the cost. This expenditure represents a heavy burden but the heaviest burden of all is our responsibility to adequately provide for the safety of our Nation. I trust we have found the proper answer to this responsibility. Future events may suggest shifts in weapon emphasis. If so, I trust all of us charged with this great decision will be quick to react. The task demands our dedicated cooperation, not stubborn opposition or selfish promotions.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT].

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, it is my intention during the next 15 minutes to do a little soul searching with you, to indulge in some plain talk, and to present to you some unvarnished facts. This issue is a very simple one with those of us who support the inclusion of the so-called RS-70 in this program. However, a principle is involved in which you are a participant, the principle of whether the Congress itself will meet its responsibility in the discharge of its duty under the Constitution to raise and maintain an Army and Navy or whether the Congress is prepared to continue its abdication of authority and failure to discharge its responsibilities.

You heard the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] yesterday make a very dynamic presentation, with which I would like to associate myself. In making these comments, let me say here and now that this is not in any manner, shape, or form or by the furthest stretch of the imagination an attack on the Secretary of Defense personally. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] yesterday indicated that this was an attack on the man—it is not. I have unhesitatingly said, and I say it here now that Robert S. McNamara is, perhaps, the strongest Secretary of Defense we have ever had and I have seen them all. There is no doubt he is one of the most brilliant and one of the most dedicated men I have ever met. He is a genius—undoubtedly so. I am fond of him personally and I know I am his friend and I hope he is my friend. But I suggest to you that the greatest friend man has is fire. We cannot exist without fire. But unless we control fire, we destroy civilization. Now let us take a look at the facts. I prefer to take my stand with the professional military man who has had years of experience, who has faced the enemy on the battlefield, who has defended his country when he saw his fellow men dying around him.

I take my stand with them in preference to the striplings who are the geniuses in the intellectual community but have never heard a shot fired in anger.

This record is replete and documented painstakingly and with much effort to develop before the committee exactly the position of the military in the case of the RS-70. For the first time in my recollection the actual vote of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has been made public and is a matter of record. Each individual Chief was asked these questions by me:

Did you at any time with the Joint Chiefs collectively discuss the pros and cons of the RS-70 with the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense?

And each Chief answered in the negative, although Mr. McNamara's testimony would indicate that this was a great family affair and many discussions were held. On every occasion except when General Taylor was named Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the military people unanimously decided that the RS-70 was a needed military weapon.

In spite of this, in spite of the consensus of an experienced congressional committee, as of last year the man in civilian clothes overruled the man in uniform. He based it on what? I do not know. Perhaps on the scientific advance, or on the admonition of Dr. Harold Brown, a 35-year-old genius who refused to tell the committee, or identify to the committee, the names of the scientists that he had conferred with. This in contrast to General LeMay who frankly told the committee the names of the scientists who said that the RS-70 was a feasible weapons system and was needed militarily. I suggest to you that Dr. Charyk can compare with Dr. Brown in the field of science, and he thinks it is a feasible military weapon.

This brings us now to the real crux of the situation; this brings us necessarily to what we are facing today. Mr. McNamara has not abused one privilege in making these decisions; he has acted within his powers, powers that we, the Congress, gave him. It is about time we face up to the situation. We either decide what powers we want to reserve to the military or allow the civilian domination as it now exists to continue; either do that or stop squawking about it.

I was very much interested in what is taking place on the other side of this building. Mr. McNamara throws his arms up and suggests that the conduct of a congressional committee is undermining confidence in the Department of Defense officials, so he sends his hatchet man out under the cloak of anonymity to say that the committee was in effect prejudiced and would not conduct a fair and objective hearing. It took the committee to smoke out Mr. Sylvester, the so-called spokesman of the Pentagon—I prefer to refer to him as the "spooksman." A man who refuses to stand up and be counted is not worthy of being accepted.

I am very much concerned with the lack of morale in the Pentagon today. I believe that the Secretary of Defense should be equally concerned with me about the morale in the Pentagon and less concerned about a congressional committee's effect on the Pentagon officials who have some explaining to do.

In my 23 years here and 21 years' association with the Armed Forces of this country, I have never seen the morale of the Pentagon at such a low ebb. The Secretaries of the services are messenger boys. When the generals pass by, I understand some even sing "Twinkle, twinkle little star, who do you think you are?"

What are you going to do about it? Are we going to sit here and be a Congress of negation or are we going to assume a positive role?

Let me assure you that other people are concerned about this situation. Last year the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], recognizing these dangers, appointed a most adequate and competent subcommittee composed of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] to examine the situation and find out how far

the Secretary of Defense was using his powers. It is all included in this report. I will read you one paragraph from it which shows the conclusion of this committee after extensive hearings:

Since it is not the function of the Congress to pass upon the legality of public laws, we cannot state that what has been done is illegal, but we certainly believe that it is contrary to the intent of Congress. But more important, perhaps, is that these independent agencies could lead to dangerous results.

The last paragraph says:

We can only conclude that the Congress has lost control of the organization of the Department and cannot carry out its responsibility unless we amend the National Security Act as suggested.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] stated:

I have read the foregoing report and find myself in full accord with the conclusions and recommendations.

If there is no one who will give the House an opportunity to vote on this subject, I will.

Keep in mind what we are doing here with the committee bill. Vote for the RS-70. Now what does that favorable vote really mean?

If I can judge by what has happened in the past, it is like going through a Rotary Club's dinner in Saskatchewan, in a small town. A favorable vote will mean as much as a luncheon club vote against an Egyptian loan. That is how much your expression means in the Department of Defense today.

But do not blame Mr. McNamara. You gave him the power. You wrote it into the law. And if you are satisfied, let it stay there. If you are not, take it out.

What have we found to date in the Secretary's alternate program? Nobody here can name me one weapons system that has been initiated since Mr. McNamara came into office which is now in production.

I can tell you the negation of the RS-70 was against the judgment of the military, the Skybolt canceled against the judgment of the military, the Nike-Zeus shoved aside against the judgment of the military. Now I hear rumors that the Dyna-Soar is going to be canceled out again against the judgment of the military.

In whose hands do we place the defense of this country? Civilian control, yes; but certainly not civilian abuse. I was part and parcel of the committee that wrote this act. At that time I raised the dangers involved. I am no Johnny-come-lately.

I heard Mr. Gilpatric last Sunday on "Meet the Press" very cleverly, very adroitly, suggest to the millions of people who listened to that popular program that there was no monarchy in the Pentagon; that the Pentagon was acting under the law that the Congress passed. That is the truth, but only half the truth. Certainly nobody had any idea that this power would be extended beyond what the Congress intended. If we must spell out the authority we mean and intended, then let us spell it out.

Mr. Chairman, these are trying times.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEBERT. I yield.

Mr. COHELAN. As the gentleman knows, I disagree with him on this particular point. But, I would like to ask the gentleman what he would suggest the Secretary of Defense do. Are you suggesting that he should accept everything that comes down from the Joint Chiefs of Staff? What role are you going to cast him in?

Mr. HEBERT. I would cast him in a role of weaponry to accept the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are the military experts. When I want an operation for appendicitis, I do not go to a lawyer to use a scalpel. When I want a writ of habeas corpus, I do not go to a doctor to get one. I go to trained people. That is what I suggest now.

Now, let me say this in answer to the gentleman's question. I suggest that the law be amended in order that the Joint Chiefs of Staff be given the power of decision in weaponry. Keep in mind this. The Congress is involved here. Do you realize this, that you only have the power of negation? You do not have any affirmative power under this act in the manner in which it is being discharged. When the Defense Department comes before your Committee on Armed Services for authorization, under the procedures and under the action which has taken place, all we can do is to deny authority; deny something. But, we cannot add, because when we do add, the Executive then refuses to recognize what we have added. This is not peculiar to the present administration. It was rampant in the previous administration, and before that and before that, and that was the time I raised this question. I raised the question when the *United States* carrier was authorized, and then President Truman canceled it on the urging of the then Secretary of Defense who was supposedly cutting all the fat from a \$13 billion budget, only to find that when Korea broke out he had cut the muscle, and we were in bad shape. Do not let that happen again.

Fat in this bill. Where? Name me one single item that can be taken out. And yet in two instances, in the matter of the RS-70 and the attack nuclear submarine, Congress and the committee in its wisdom has added these two items. What is going to happen to them will be of interest. Do we not have something to say about this country? Are we going to be passive people, merely listen to testimony, without contributing what our years of knowledge and service have vested in us? I am not ready to accept that suggestion at all, and I do not think you are. We must go before this country backing the Committee on Armed Services to the hilt. The chairman of the committee, who sits over there, with 49 years of service in this Congress, perhaps knows more about the military than any individual here, and he stands up and says we need this. He said it last year and we backed him, and the majority are backing him now.

Oh, yes, my colleagues, the day of decision is here. Let us be prepared to

discharge our responsibility. Let us rededicate ourselves to the fact that we must have the strongest military institution in the world and that we must continue civilian control as we intended it. The Commander in Chief is in charge, but we must recognize what our professional military men say.

Why, coming out in the pay bill next week Members will find great retirement benefits given to our retiring generals. I think it is a waste if we are giving this money out to people who do not know what they are talking about. This is no disrespect to the Secretary or anyone. But it is a plea and a challenge and a hope that this Congress will protect its own integrity and will stand up for the Nation and say that we represent the people, we speak for the people, and we accept that responsibility in the name of the people.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I just want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I hope he looks over his remarks very carefully and does not permit himself to be placed in a position where he is any way criticizing the judgment of the Secretary of Defense, for the very simple reason that on the ticker tape this morning there was a statement carried which was made by the Secretary of Defense at the National Press Club where he, apparently because of a low boiling point, thinks we are picking on him as an individual. But yesterday I said very emphatically in my remarks exactly what the gentleman from Louisiana has said today—that I respect the Secretary of Defense as an individual. But the Secretary of Defense has taken apparently the attitude that we have no right to criticize the procedures being followed by the Armed Forces and the Department of Defense.

Mr. HEBERT. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am very emphatic about this. I am not criticizing the Secretary. I again say I am very fond of the Secretary as an individual and personally I have told him already "You do not think the Congress is a necessary evil. You think it is an unnecessary evil." I have suggested even that neither Congress nor the Constitution has endowed the Secretary of Defense with the cloak of infallibility.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I have listened attentively to everything everyone has had to say during the course of this debate on this procurement authorization. However, I do not think anyone has pinpointed the circumstances that exist quite as well as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] has done today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I wholeheartedly concur with what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] has had to say about the RS-70 and the Secretary of Defense, and I do not take

this to be a personal attack upon the Secretary of Defense, by any stretch of the imagination. I think it is a justifiable criticism. I personally feel that he has every ability, but I think he is prone to lean upon computer statistics in arriving at his answers. I have not found a computer that has an input for human nature, and I think the present Secretary of Defense ignores human nature. However, I feel that human nature is a very important part of this operation. We simply must build manned airplanes such as the RS-70 and we must not ignore our military specialists.

Mr. HEBERT. I will say to the gentleman in replying that I have to return to a very well-known Democratic President who speaks the language that I like so well, Harry Truman, who said:

If you cannot stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] suggest that to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I think my distinguished subcommittee chairman, for whom I have a very warm regard, and with whom on this occasion I strongly disagree, for yielding. But I would hope, and I sincerely ask this, that now the gentleman has had this exercise in exposing what he believes to be wrong with the Secretary of Defense, that the gentleman will take some further time before the afternoon is over and tell us what the gentleman thinks is wrong or is right about the B-70, RS-70 program. This, of course, is the fundamental point at issue.

Mr. HEBERT. I intend to do exactly that.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill which authorizes in excess of \$15.8 billion for the defense of our country. This represents a large sum of money and, yet, it is only a portion of the \$54 billion which is to be spent on military preparedness this coming fiscal year.

War has never been a pleasant or cheap business regardless of the context in which that word is used. Its magnitude of destruction has today reached a point beyond the comprehension of man. Indecision and unpreparedness have often been the twins that have led to war. Let us be certain that in our day and time that we are decisive and that we are prepared.

In yesterday's debate there was considerable discussion concerning the solvency of the Nation and the impact of military spending. The balance between what we need and what we can afford is not difficult. The fact is that we must provide whatever is necessary to make this Nation secure. The difficult decision really rests in eliminating those items that we can properly and safely do without. All of us must constantly explore every avenue of possible saving, and this certainly applies to every program whether it is military or otherwise.

I would suggest, however, that this will not be easy and I would like to cite some examples of problems that we will face.

A year ago, the Armed Services Committee expressed its dissatisfaction with the Navy's shipbuilding program and a special committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] was established. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and I also served on this committee.

This committee concluded that if the Navy followed its shipbuilding program, which averaged 24 ships per year between 1948 and 1963, it would have only 503 ships in 1973, or 357 ships less than the Navy indicates it needs. If the program of last year alone was followed, which was the highest of the postwar years, there would still be a shortage of 206 ships by 1973. This year, although the number of ships increased from 37 to 43, the fact remains that the cost of the shipbuilding program is cut by almost a half billion dollars. We are only building smaller ships.

If I had any idea, or if anyone had the idea, that this was a real saving, we would have reason for encouragement. However, all we are really doing is putting off the inevitable day when a terrifically expanded fleet must be built. In the meantime, our shipyards might well close and we have already lost a large number of our skilled workers.

The committee was also advised that unless the Air Force recommendation of 45 T-39(A) jet trainers was accepted, that the production lines would close down. It would have to be reopened at a later date, and the cost of these planes would be increased by a cost of 25 percent. The money for these planes was denied in the bill.

I only wish to make this point. We must eliminate every bit of waste that can be found in the defense budget, but when we do it let us be certain we are not undermining our security or practicing false economy.

Before I close, I would like to refer to the RS-70. When the Secretary of Defense makes the bold decision to eliminate some of the huge costs connected with defense, we should bend over backwards to support him as long as we are satisfied that the security of our country is not being impaired. This I have tried to do but from the possible effects of such action I am constrained to follow an opposite course.

Years ago, in discussing matters of defense with an expert in countermeasures, I became convinced that a mix in our weapons was the best answer to our security. Once we have decided to follow one course, the problem for a potential enemy becomes much more simple and his defense costs much less.

Has Russia today a Nike-Zeus, or can it develop an effective one? If the answer to either of these questions is affirmative then in those years when the B-58 and the B-47 are obsolete, we must have a weapon system different from a ballistic missile which might be destroyed by techniques now under study and development. I would suggest, that once the decision was made to develop three RS-70 planes, we should be ready to marry the plane with a weapons sys-

tem so that it can add to our offensive capabilities.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, I support the bill before us. Although we must examine every program to save every dime possible, let us also make certain that in the years ahead when the funds being spent now have become a part of our arsenal that there will be no regrets of our decisions of today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. At the outset of your remarks you said this bill totaled \$14,800 million. On page 3 of the report I read that the new total of this bill, H.R. 2440, is \$15,856,391,000.

Mr. BATES. If the gentleman will excuse me, I meant to name that figure of \$15,856 million plus and the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does this figure include the proposed \$363 million for the RS-70 program?

Mr. BATES. Yes, it is in there.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, previous speakers have explained many parts of the bill before us (H.R. 2440). Understandably, there are sharp differences of opinion among us about what the size, character, and cost of the missile, the RS-70, and the manned bomber programs should be. Without questioning the overriding importance of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, it is my purpose to remind my colleagues that the only actual and really likely warfare in the world today is typified by such combat as we have seen at the Bay of Pigs, in the mountains of India, and in the jungles and swamps of Asia and Africa. With a nuclear stalemate of sorts apparently in existence, this situation may continue for some years to come. That is why it seems necessary to call attention to a relatively minor, but vitally significant, part of the authorizations now under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, in a world fascinated by missiles, satellites, space exploration, and possible trips to the moon, how easy it is to ignore these real situations that confront our armed services throughout the world today. Let us ask ourselves what use could we make of nuclear missiles, for example, in southeast Asia, in Africa, in Cuba, or elsewhere in Latin America? It is now clear that it is Communist policy, for the present, at least, to use subversion, sabotage, staged uprisings, and rigged revolutions to advance toward their eternal goal of world domination. To deny them success with these methods we need a mobile flexible Army that can instantly meet these threats to our security wherever and whenever they appear. These Communist tactics give Army aircraft an entirely new dimension in our overall defense.

The House Armed Services Committee in this bill, H.R. 2440, is recommending approval of an authorization of \$522.1 million for the procurement of aircraft for the Army.

Army aviation has always been an integral and vital part of the organization of the modern Army. Today, however, it is needed more than ever to enhance the mobility, firepower, flexibility, and command control of our ground combat forces. The growing integration of ground and air vehicles now in progress appears to be one of the most promising developments in bringing vastly increased strength to our ground combat ability. The modern mission of Army aviation is to insure prompt, sustained, and successful combat on land by providing aerial observation, airlift for troop movement to and about the immediate battlefield, rapid movement of supplies in the forward areas, aerial delivered firepower, command liaison and communication, and combat zone casualty evacuation.

Mr. Chairman, the Army must move more and more through the air if it is to gain the decisive battlefield mobility it requires to win. This relatively new dimension of ground force mobility uses the first few hundred feet above the earth's surface for its operations. This is also the space where the shells, bullets, and some short range missiles also fly. But this air mobility permits instantaneous reaction to the enemy through the rapid deployment of combat troops without regard to the restrictions of the terrain. This permits the commander in the field to literally lift the soldier out of the mud and swiftly move him to another location for maximum effectiveness.

The very obvious need for this mobility is reflected in the increased requirements for more Army aircraft and additional related personnel provided for in the bill before us. We must also replace obsolete and worn-out aircraft.

A recent study of the Army's tactical mobility requirements indicates that this need for aerial mobility will continue to grow in the years ahead. While improved ground vehicles will also play an important role, many of them will be replaced in the foreseeable future by aerial vehicles for the simple reason that aircraft possess capabilities for certain Army tasks which are not available in ground vehicles. The use of Army aircraft in the present hostilities in southeast Asia is a good example. Fixed-wing light transport companies and helicopter units are supporting South Vietnamese forces there. Army aviation has already carried over one-quarter million troops and passengers and thousands of tons of combat supplies in South Vietnam. Enemy ground fire has resulted in only four of our helicopters being totally lost because for most flights the Army provides armed helicopters or other armed aircraft as escorts. Arming these air "vehicles" is an extension of the Army's policy of arming its ground combat vehicles.

The Armed Services Committee supports the increased requirements in Army aviation provided for in this bill and recommends approval of the authorization of \$522.1 million for procurement of Army aircraft. For maximum Army effectiveness this authorization is essential and deserves our strongest support.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to match the eloquence and the logic of my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], but I would like to pursue the same matter he spoke about so effectively a few moments ago. I shall confine my remarks to probably the most important phase of our military activity—research and development.

All of us know that to stand still in this modern atomic and nuclear age is to invite defeat and that to wait until an emergency is with us before developing the tools with which to meet that emergency is tantamount to national suicide.

Where would we be today had not Dr. Philip A. Abelson, together with Mr. Gunn, not drawn the plans for an atomic submarine even before Admiral Rickover came to the Bureau of Ships? Where would we be today if Wernher von Braun and some of his colleagues had not been evacuated from Peenemünde to give us a start in developing modern missiles?

Remember the old controversy that existed prior to World War II, when certain agencies of the U.S. Government were arguing bitterly over the advisability of developing air-cooled aircraft engines as opposed to liquid-cooled aircraft engines? Someone made the decision that we should develop both of them. That decision later proved to be fortunate as we found that our liquid-cooled P-40 fighter aircraft could not obtain enough elevation to fight the Japanese zeros over Guadalcanal. Fortunately we had planes with air-cooled engines to save the day, and regain the control of the air over Guadalcanal. Just suppose we had had a hardheaded, obstinate Research Department head at that time who said, "No, I have decided you are going to develop the liquid-cooled engine only." What might have happened? We would not have had control of the air over Guadalcanal. How long would it have taken, and how many additional thousands of American lives would it have cost to win the war?

Research and development is probably the most vital activity of the Defense Department. I have a great and deep respect for the intellect and the technical knowledge of Dr. Harold Brown. He is an able technician. But I was amazed to hear him, when questioned by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], refuse to tell a committee of Congress the name of the four or five military men whose advice he had sought on the question of the RS-70. I wish I could interpret it otherwise—but to me that was outright defiance. At this point I became seriously concerned as to how decisions are made and how much the military requirement as expressed by the military man is actually considered in making research and development decisions.

Let me relate an incident which is relatively minor. Sometime a couple of years ago the Navy, for the Marine Corps, expressed a military requirement for an assault support helicopter, and

the military requirement expressed was very, very specific. It was to have a payload capability of 1,200 pounds. It was to be small enough to fit aft of a destroyer so that the Navy could carry on its Dash program on its Fram destroyers and there were other specific requirements. A private company—and it matters not which company it was—spent \$1.6 million of its own money to develop such an aircraft. The Navy and the Defense Department made the decision, however, that they would prefer a much heavier aircraft which cost about four times as much.

I am sure they made this decision for good reason, because the number of aircraft to be acquired was so small that it was better to go ahead with the heavier item already in production. So, I do not question the decision.

However, following the decision not to procure this particular new type of helicopter, I suggested to Dr. Harold Brown that since one branch of the service had expressed a specific military requirement for this particular type of aircraft, that it might be wise to carry on the research and development program so that if we had such a military requirement in the future, the aircraft would be ready. And, under date of June 16, 1962, Dr. Brown, who is a technical man and not a military man, wrote to me and he said that present helicopters will fill the military requirement for the assault support helicopter mission for the next decade.

Now, I want to know, do they teach clairvoyance at MIT? How can this purely technical man tell us what the military requirement is going to be for the next 10 years?

I questioned the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, General Colglazier, during the hearings. I asked him if the helicopter which was presently used in an assault support mission met the military requirement for the next decade. He said "I don't think that I could give you that assurance." Later he said, "And as we go along we may find that we have other requirements."

I questioned General Beach, who is Chief of Staff for Research and Development, and he indicated that the military "would be delighted" with a new development which would meet the military requirement at less money. Here are clear-cut statements of top military men admitting there might be such a requirement, but 35-year-old Dr. Harold Brown can tell us that the next decade does not require anything beyond what we have today. Is this type of thinking being applied in other areas and in major decisions?

I honestly and sincerely feel that military advice is being ignored and that civilians, without proper military experience and military background, are being arbitrary in their decisions and are superimposing those decisions on the long experience of tried and true military men.

I express the same concern, not as eloquently, but certainly as forthrightly, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. I certainly think this Congress should take a serious look at this situation so that we can have a defense

policy which is the combined product of defense managerial ability and practical military knowledge.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my very good and able friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, in my brief remarks I intend only to discuss the RS-70 program.

The question as to whether we go ahead with the development of the RS-70 weapons system involves far more than this specific program. As I pointed out in debate last year on this subject, among the other main issues at stake is the future of the manned aircraft in our Air Force. In my opinion there is no question but that Congress should authorize and appropriate adequate funds for our Air Force to continue the development of this important weapons system. Wisely, I think the Congress has for the last 2 years authorized and appropriated sufficient funds for the orderly development of the RS-70. It is no responsibility of Congress that the Department of Defense has refused to use these funds. The Defense Department, in addition to refusing to use the funds given to them for the development of the RS-70, also refused to build an additional wing of B-52 bombers although such construction was authorized and adequate funds were appropriated. So today all production of long-distance bombers has ceased and production lines have been dismantled.

No one today knows of a certainty whether the RS-70 ever will be needed. But the RS-70 is the result of the best minds and experience in our country in the field of the manned bomber. Those in our Air Force, those who have spent a lifetime learning the problems of air warfare and how to deal with those problems, those who are acquainted with the design, use and operation of manned aircraft, almost without exception believe that the RS-70 is necessary and will be well ahead of any other plane in this or any other country. The almost universal belief of the officers of our Air Force and our leading engineers and technicians in this field is that if we are to remain ahead of Russia in the air we must develop the RS-70 weapons system. For some years the United States has held a commanding lead in the development, production and operation of manned aircraft. Undoubtedly this superiority has contributed to the stopping of Russian aggression; how much none of us knows for sure.

It is disconcerting that the United States at this time is abandoning manned aircraft while Russia is building more planes and developing better planes. Despite our present lead in the field of manned aircraft, if the Soviets continue development and production and we, on the contrary, continue our failure to develop and manufacture planes, it is only a question of time until Russia is superior to us. It is merely a repetition of the fable of the tortoise and the hare—we will be the hare which stopped and Russia the tortoise which passes us.

I do not know whether we will ever need the additional B-52's or the RS-70; neither does Secretary McNamara or Dr. Brown, the Defense Department head of research and development. I do know that the fact that America remained preeminent in the ability to make conventional war, including manned aircraft, enabled us to secure the military and diplomatic triumph that we did in the Lebanon affair of July 1958. In the summer of 1958 Khrushchev was moving into the Near East and was backing his aggression with wild threats of destruction against the United States and the Western World. Russia has never been more threatening. Yet, the United States was able and willing to act and we did act. President Eisenhower moved troops by plane from Germany into Lebanon. We continued to move military personnel and equipment by air and sea. When Khrushchev saw that we had the determination and ability to resist Communist aggression, his tirade of hate and bitterness calmed. On July 24, just 9 days after we landed our first troops in Lebanon, Khrushchev attended a party at the Polish Embassy in Moscow where he visited the table of our Ambassador Thompson and, in the most friendly manner, remained with our Ambassador for an hour and a half. It was a great victory for America—we had demonstrated our ability to resist aggression not only by nuclear war but by a conventional operation.

Please remember that if it had been some years earlier when we ceased the manufacture and development of manned aircraft, we would have been unable to act as we did in Lebanon. What if the United States had been inferior to Russia in manned aircraft? We would have been unable to act. We do not know what the results would have been if we had been weak in the field of manned aircraft.

Prior to the 1960 election, candidate John F. Kennedy criticized the mass retaliation policy of John Foster Dulles. Mr. Kennedy stated that the United States must not depend totally on mass destruction but must be able to handle "brush fire" wars throughout the world. Yet today we are moving in a pattern of military planning which, if followed to its conclusion, would leave us only the choice of visiting mass destruction on our enemy or doing nothing.

I want us to be able in the future to handle crises as we handled the Lebanon crisis of 1958.

Today we have in the Department of Defense certain persons to whom many refer as the "whiz kids." Please understand that I am not using this term to refer to the Secretary of Defense or the three service Secretaries. I do not want to speak disparagingly of those who are called "whiz kids." They are capable and I believe dedicated men. They certainly lack practical experience, but they are certain that they have the answers to all problems; they are certain that they could not make an error in judgment. These men have made war in their own mind an absolute science. No one will dispute the importance of science in the military field, but Mr. Chairman,

history has proved that warfare is not an exact science. Through the centuries we have had those individuals, occasionally in uniform but usually not, who were certain that they had invented a weapon or plan that could insure military success. They placed all of their eggs in one basket, so to speak. They believe that they have taken the risk out of war. Many nations have fallen because their leaders' planned solution did not fit the war which actually took place.

One of the greatest dangers in military planning is to assume that you have arrived at a single perfect solution to the next military problem which will confront you. History is replete with such errors, some of them most serious. I well remember the early days of World War II. I was in the Pacific at that time, but not in the theater involved. I well remember a British officer who visited us and vividly described the failure of the operation in Burma. The British Army commander in Burma had decided that the Japanese tanks could not cross rice paddies, so no plan was made on the left flank to defend against a tank attack. The Japanese tanks could cross rice paddies and the British left flank crumbled. This failure to properly defend against the Japanese tanks was the principal reason the British Army was forced out of Burma.

I recall reading in 1938 about the brilliant plan that Maurice Gamelin had invented which would insure that France would be secure from attack. General Gamelin had decided that much of the action and planning of the French marshals of the past was in error. General Gamelin had a plan which would insure the safety of France—that plan was the Maginot line. Although he was in uniform, General Gamelin might well have been referred to as one of the "whiz kids" of that era.

I could discuss for an hour cases from history where military and political leaders have relied on some new, fool-proof plan to insure victory. The problem has always been that no one can foretell what form or direction an enemy will take. War is not an exact science. The Secretary of Defense makes a very convincing defense of his policy. After listening to him, I am inclined to agree that he is right, that we will not need manned aircraft in the future. But I am not willing to put all our eggs in one basket. I am not willing to gamble that he is right. I am not willing to gamble with the security of this Nation.

I do not want to unduly continue this line of thinking, but I would like to tell a story which illustrates what I mean. In telling this story I must give credit to the great story teller, my colleague the gentleman from Florida, BILLY MATTHEWS.

Before the commencement of the Civil War, Mr. Sylvaneus Lee, of Georgia, in a speech advocating war against the North, said vehemently that the South could whip the Yankees with cornstalks. After the war, while he was making a speech as a candidate for public office in Georgia, a member of his audience took him to task, asking, "How can we trust your judgment when you told us

before the war we could whip the Yankees with cornstalks?" Mr. Sylvaneus Lee quickly retorted, "Yes, we could have; but those damn Yankees didn't use cornstalks."

None of us knows exactly from what direction and in what manner danger will approach us. We do not know the plan or the weapon that a potential enemy will use. Enemies of tomorrow may not use cornstalks. Before too radical a plan is proposed for our war of the future, it might be well for us to give more thought to the trained military men of the past. Let us not gamble away our security. Let us be ready for any eventuality.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for a member of my established fiscal responsibility endeavors, and record for conserving our human and natural resources, to discuss any program involving additional or alleged excessive expenditures. I would even support across the board reductions in most procurement and R. & D. areas, but I believe experience, honesty and the record should be reported and kept straight concerning the RS-70.

Based on a visit to Palmdale, Calif., November 29, 1962, where North American Aviation continues to develop this modern and sophisticated reconnaissance-strike manned system—at their own expense with the help of occasionally released funds appropriated by this body and held by the Secretary of Defense—I should like to say: In this area we should not hide behind the age-old word game, or play musical-chair games with semantics.

The aircraft portion of the RS-70 is ready to fly. The engines are mounted and breakthroughs have been made on the new principles necessary so the honeycombed skin and tanks can be sealed, and wings welded to absorb the mach 3 plus temperature of friction and strain in atmosphere of near-space. This first craft is ready to fly, and as each of its six engines has developed a higher percentage of thrust than expected, so has each component test revealed safety factors, and proper functioning, beyond highest expectation. One should recall that the flight date of December 1962, was set by the Pentagon slip-stick experts 4 plus years ago, and not by the actual producers. Such dates ultimately depend on funds, lack of interruption and scientific breakthroughs, now accomplished.

Having crawled through the entire structure, including the titanium covered extended neck of this "bird as though in flight," plus the crew compartment and the stainless steel after two-thirds of wing and body, I am enthusiastic about its capabilities; from that of loitering ability as a manned vehicle, to speeds beyond that of interceptor aircraft, and known missile or radar reacting anticraft capability. Now, Mr. Chairman, all concepts must cease as drawing board improvements at some stage, and go into actual prototype production. This is now a fact for the

RS-70. It is just as unfair to report it as being under development—or in the drawing stage—as it is to depend on missiles; four out of the last six of which have misfired and been destroyed in most recent tests. I am convinced this plane will fly, will be evasive due to its speed, altitude and other capabilities, and further that the research and cost of this prototype has and will be of greatest value in other developments.

Think, Mr. Chairman, of the inertial factors and forward momentum plus directional glide capabilities of a warhead with fins, launched at mach 3 which exceeds muzzle velocity of a bullet—to say naught of its own inherent propellant and our ability to control its on-target ability. One must consider as a whole the RS-70, side sweep capabilities, and resolution radar—already developed—which could reconnoiter and strike with existing weapons, the entire United States of America in two transcontinental sweeps, or one round trip. The same applies to the North Atlantic Ocean in four sweeps, or two round trips. Imagine this strategic value in isolated ship hunts, and seizures, if for no other reason. I would like to emphasize the features of manned control, air alert, and missile strike—Hound Dog or GAM-2—plus speed, maneuverability, and recall as an all-out initial or postretaliatory missile checkup weapon. Remember we are planning for the future which involves total annihilatory possibilities.

The RS-70 is so fast it can be currently completely evasive while economical of fuel, at high altitudes. It can also be used at low level, based on the newly approved aerodynamic principle. When not loitering and presumably on a run, there is only 6 seconds between the side-sweep or forward squint of the resolution radar, not 3 minutes. However, even amateurs like myself can react to the magnificent portrayal of this electronic sweep and squint within the weapon, and perform the necessary reflex motion to get off a retaliatory—or clean up—strike within two seconds on repeated trials. It is capable of standoff reconnaissance and clean up strike from a safe distance and even in its aft quarters and vectors—where it has already overflowed.

Gentlemen, it would appear to me that having invested \$1.2 billion over many years—admittedly with repeated interruptions—that we should certainly invest \$343 million more for the security of our country and the pipeline or follow-on development of this excellent craft, which is in being to the extent of full equipage; and adding at least the last two RS-70's to our Nation's inventory, resources, and armament. It is fact and not theory. It will require continued divergence of Russian follow-on and dilution of their defense capabilities. Most of all, it is our controlled answer to Russian missiles if in our will we are to await the first strike, and it will indeed be our freedom platform of 1964.

Fire the Department of Defense "whiz-kids," if you will, release the Arthur Sylvesters and the Yermolinskis' and good riddance; even change again the McCormack-Curtis amendment and reduce the power of the Secretary of Defense,

but, gentlemen, you cannot in conscience eliminate this vital weapons system.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, although I believe the need for enactment of H.R. 2440 has been clearly indicated by Chairman VINSON and my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee, I would like to add a few words to what has already been said in support of this legislation.

The number and type of weapons authorized in this annual bill are naturally governed chiefly by the level of military preparedness the current world situation demands. The unswerving determination of those who direct the Communist conspiracy to attain their announced goals convincingly proves that we cannot risk letting down our guard. We must maintain a defense posture that is capable of meeting any crisis or emergency that may arise anywhere in the world. This need is dramatically illustrated by the Communist threat existing today only 90 miles from our shores.

The adversaries of freedom have made tremendous progress in the technology of mass destruction. We must, therefore, more than ever before in our Nation's history, have in our military inventory sufficient weapons and force to survive a massive nuclear attack and to deliver a decisive counterblow.

The Committee on Armed Services has conducted extensive hearings to determine the requirements of the military departments for new equipment and for continuing research. This bill is the result of those hearings, at which detailed presentations were made by our military chiefs and by key civilian officials of the Defense Establishment.

In this bill we are specifically authorizing research funds in addition to those for procurement. Well over \$3 billion of the \$15,856,391,000 expenditure authorized by H.R. 2440 is for research, development and related activities. This sum includes the committee amendment authorizing the investment of \$363,700,000 for use in developing two additional airframes of the RS-70 bomber and supporting systems, designed to demonstrate this aircraft's value as a strategic weapons system. This is a wise amendment which I wholeheartedly endorse.

The committee has taken the position that our national defense effort, to be truly effective, must be based on a balanced and flexible military force—a force that can be employed at any time and at any place, either wholly or in part, to effectively counter any type of aggression, be it guerrilla warfare or nuclear attack. To that end, we have stressed the grave importance of not relying entirely on our missile capability for our military strength.

Manned strategic aircraft would greatly enhance operational flexibility by allowing recall of an attack or redirection, making possible greater control and discretion in the use of nuclear weapons, stepped-up airborne alerts and large-scale maneuvers, wartime assessment of target damage, location and destruction of mobile targets, a close matching of the weapon to the target

and, if necessary, the use of very-high-yield warheads.

Those who would leave strategic bombers to die a slow death should not forget that the RS-70's strike power will be greatly enhanced by these extraordinary reconnaissance aids and by its potential in the area of communications.

I think it is important to note that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with one exception, supported the development of the RS-70 at a substantially higher level than that currently planned under the program of the Secretary of Defense.

To demonstrate the wisdom of this program I call to the attention of the Members of the House factual information with respect to the performance of the J-93 engine which will power the RS-70. Needless to say, there are many features of this engine which cannot be disclosed at this time for security reasons.

The J-93 engine is a lightweight after-burning turbojet which has been designed for sustained mach 3 cruise operation as well as for high takeoff thrust. It will operate in an environment in which temperatures vary from subzero at sea level to intense heat at mach 3 at an altitude of more than 70,000 feet. The extensive technological developments unique to the J-93 make it, I believe, the most outstanding turbojet product in the world today.

The J-93 has completed three initial qualification tests. Additional tests were conducted to qualify improved life, hardware and reliability. Although the engine has not yet been flown, it has successfully completed over 3,000 hours of engine operation, nearly 600 of which have been at simulated high Mach conditions. This includes development testing and altitude performance tests conducted at Arnold Engineering Development Center. In the altitude performance tests the airflow through and around the engine was heated to air vehicular temperatures of more than 550° F. Results of these tests clearly demonstrate that the engine has met or exceeds performance guarantees in terms of power output and fuel consumption.

A number of engines were delivered to North American Aviation during the period of June to August 1962. The J-93, with its breakthroughs and operating temperatures, performance and environmental capabilities, provides a stepping stone of technology for the next generation of air breathing propulsion systems. Additional improvements are being studied for potential applications for large subsonic cargo aircraft to very high mach turboramjet applications.

While we recognize the capabilities of the Secretary of Defense, we do think that he has erred in his decision with respect to the RS-70, and we sincerely hope that once again Congress will approve this legislation which would make it possible to proceed with development of the RS-70 bomber as a full weapons system.

The legislation before us today is consistent with maintenance of a military posture sufficient to deter aggression on the part of those who strive for world domination. The price of national security is high indeed, but it must be paid.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLANCY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I, on behalf of the Ohio delegation, congratulate the gentleman [Mr. CLANCY] on one of the most able speeches which has yet been made on this bill. We are very proud of the services he has rendered both in the Committee on Armed Services, and on the floor, in regard to this legislation. He has helped all of us by his very able presentation and explanation of the matter before us.

Mr. CLANCY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 2440 and the committee amendments. The total authorizations for ships, planes, missiles, and research and development, in the amount of \$15,856,391,000, is, of course, an enormous amount of money. I wish the state of the world were such that a much smaller amount could be adequate. It is not.

The hearings before the Armed Services Committee have convinced this Member that any lower ceiling for authorizations would not permit the adequate arming of this country to face the possible eventualities of the next year. I support these authorizations out of an abiding conviction that these steps must be taken.

It may be asked how I can support these authorizations and continue to cry for lower national expenditures. For I have repeatedly expressed my concern at the present size of our national debt, and at the planned deficit of nearly \$12 billion for the fiscal 1964 budget. Continuous deficit financing can eventually bring us to national disaster as fully as can our enemies from outside.

I recognize that the appropriations under this authorization will constitute a share of the fiscal 1964 deficit, unless offset by cuts elsewhere.

I am especially mindful of the fact that this authorization contains \$497,700,000 more than the Department of Defense has requested, \$363,700,000 for development of two additional RS-70 airplanes with associated electronic gear and missiles, and \$134 million for two additional hunter-killer type atomic submarines.

Just recently this Member voted against a supplemental appropriation of more than a half billion dollars for the Commodity Credit Corporation. I did so knowing we had to draw the line on expenditures, knowing we had to set priorities for spending. And I believe that the authorizations in this bill here today should receive No. 1 priority.

Much has already been said by the distinguished chairman and colleagues of the Committee on Armed Services with reference to the additional items contained in this bill, and with respect to the necessity for them.

I propose to add only this. Late last fall, I spent 2 weeks with the antisubmarine forces of the Navy. As has been

pointed out, Soviet submarines numbering several times the size of the group with which Hitler started World War II constitute the main threat to our use of international sealanes, and present a growing missile threat to our continent.

Preparing to meet this threat, which is beginning to contain significant numbers of nuclear Russian submarines, is not a glamorous undertaking. Our anti-submarine forces attract little public attention. But they work long, difficult hours on tasks directly related to the survival of this country. They cannot do the job without modern weapons. One such vital weapon is the nuclear attack submarine.

Six such submarines next year are not enough—eight just barely fill the need.

The necessity is so great, I believe, that our desire for a balanced budget must in this case be subordinated to the need, and reductions in spending must be made in other areas of less urgency with respect to our survival.

The same may be said of the RS-70. The case for this airplane has been most ably presented by the chairman of our committee and others. We strongly believe that our country must have the option to build the RS-70 during the latter 1960's, if circumstances require it. Without these additional funds that option will not exist and the days of the strategic bomber will be limited to the service life of existing B-52's and B-58's.

The RS-70 concept not only offers us the prospect of a very advanced manned bomber, with highly sophisticated electronic equipment, but its development will rapidly advance the state of technology in airplanes, engines and navigational gear which can be applied to the construction of civilian supersonic airplanes for the next decade.

Mr. Chairman, big as the authorization is in the bill, I urge its passage. It constitutes less than one-third of the total proposed military budget, but a most important and vital part it is. I believe it may be possible to make some cuts elsewhere in appropriations for the Department of Defense and in other governmental areas, to not only offset the additional sums contained in this bill, but to make significant reductions in the overall budget costs for fiscal 1964.

Our military hardware, however, is no place to have a clearance sale.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, too many times I believe we have been giving a blank check to the Department of Defense for any or everything they want or request. This is not good business management of either the taxpayer's money or of the establishment of the best or most effective military posture.

I am not convinced that we are getting our money's worth in our defense spending, particularly in the broad field of research, testing, and development. I am concerned that we do not have a more close coordination of the research, test, and development programs of the various services. It appears to me that there is considerable overlap of projects

in the various services in this field of research, testing, and development.

Our very capable chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has assured me, however, that he has appointed a special subcommittee to investigate this situation and will actively pursue an immediate program to initiate efficiencies not only in research, testing, and development but in all departments of defense spending. The Defense Department and the various military departments have given us this assurance, also.

Mr. Chairman, I will support this authorization, H.R. 2440, today, but this action in no manner indicates my willingness to support an appropriation bill if studies that are now underway, confirm my thinking that this amount of expenditure is unnecessary to maintain a strong military posture.

Now, briefly, I would like to address you on the question of the necessity of the additional appropriation for the RS-70, which appears to be the greatest point of disagreement on this bill. I am proud to be known as a conservative, watchful of the Federal taxpayers' dollars expended by this great body of the representatives of our people, but I do favor the extension of the RS-70 program.

I favor the additional appropriation for the development of the RS-70 and the accompanying weapons systems for three basic reasons, and I am going to put them to you simply.

First of all, it is a good investment. We have spent \$1.3 billion developing three planes, and all we have is just a plane that will fly fast. Now, where I come from, in Texas, if you were in the drilling business and you went out and spent \$1.3 billion to build a big substructure and derrick for drilling oil wells, you do not have much until you hook up the complete drilling system and get it running. By investing \$1.2 billion in addition to the \$1.3 billion we already have, we will not only get three rigs but five rigs ready to drill, complete with pumps, pits, draw works, and related necessary equipment. I say this is a wise investment. We have the substructure; we have the derricks, and now we need the equipment to make this thing work.

The second point is in the area of enemy defense spending. The effect which the development of the RS-70 weapons system would have on the enemy would be great. The current Soviet air defense system of Soviet interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles would be so seriously degraded by the capabilities of the RS-70 as to become practically worthless. Those defenses could be penetrated beyond all doubt. What we are saying is we are going to put them on the defensive for once if we develop this RS-70, and let them do a little of this defense spending. Let them start developing some new interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles and try to knock these things down. Make them go into deficit spending for defense for a change.

My third point is this: All members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with the exception of the new Chairman, supported the

development of the RS-70. And I think they know more about what is going on than civilians do. It is recognized that there is some difference of opinion as to precisely what the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported.

But in the report Members will find that there is no doubt that the Joint Chiefs, without a single exception noted, supported the development of the RS-70 at a substantially higher level of development than that currently planned under the program of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, these are the three reasons why I favor the continued development of the RS-70. Personally, I would like to see us include the RS-70 program and the advanced killer subs in this bill, but do it by trimming in other areas so that we stay within, or below, the administration's request.

Mr. Chairman, as for me, I can see no logic whatever, in the thinking of the fuzzy-eyed negotiators and the lily-livered diplomats who propose we stop our arms buildup and turn our military equipment and forces over to a one-world U.N. force.

Mr. Chairman, I want no part of this give-in, no-win policy toward communism.

The development of this advanced arms superiority, including the RS-70, will assure the world that we are not now only the strongest Nation in the world, but that we also intend to stay the strongest Nation in the world, the strongest, most powerful Nation, not so other nations will fear us, but so that we may be respected to have the strength and the guts and the will to stand up for freedom here and around the world.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to be certain it is specifically understood that what we are considering here today is an authorization bill. Not one penny will be appropriated for expenditure if the House and subsequently the Senate enacts this bill as it is—not one penny.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill becomes law, then the Committee on Appropriations can and will take action on all of the items contained in the bill for fiscal year 1964, as well as numerous other items which will carry the Defense Department request up to the \$52-billion-plus program that the President has recommended.

Then we have a third step: Even if the Congress appropriates the money, no Chief Executive under current interpretation has a mandatory obligation to spend it for any program or policy. So, this bill is the first in three steps that must be taken in the Congress and subsequently in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to confine my remaining remarks primarily to the committee amendment involving the RS-70. It is my intention to vote for this amendment for the reason that I believe it wise in an authorization bill for the executive branch of the Government to have ample leeway over and above what even they have programed for the next fiscal year.

As was indicated in the request by the President and by Mr. McNamara, there is no new authorization or funds in the fiscal 1964 request for the RS-70. Under current plans they will have carryover from fiscal 1963 of around \$81 million, as I recall the figure. However, in this bill the committee is recommending an additional \$373.7 million authorization. I see no harm whatsoever in this extra authorization being on the statute books.

Under no circumstances, however, do I want my last statement to indicate that I intend as a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to recommend or approve additional money of this magnitude in fiscal year 1964. I will make that determination as to the specific appropriation after we have concluded our hearings and considered the matter in the Subcommittee for Defense Appropriations. This will come 2 or 3 months from now. However I think it is wise to have a little leeway over and above what the President has recommended for authorization so that our committee and the Congress can have an opportunity if it wants to do so to go higher than the President and Secretary of Defense McNamara have proposed.

Mr. Chairman, there is an even more important point: Suppose the Congress did not authorize more than what the President recommended, and suppose that the Congress did not appropriate any more money than the President recommended, and then Congress adjourned? Come October or November, subsequent to adjournment, it is perfectly conceivable that circumstances might be such that the President and the Department of Defense would want to spend money for the RS-70 over and above the \$81 million, which represents the current anticipated carryover of the authorization and appropriation. Unless we have an authorization for more than has been proposed they could not spend a penny more. But if we are wise enough to give them the extra leeway on the authorization, and even if we did not appropriate the extra money in the appropriation bill, there is a safety valve in the Appropriation Act. This, Mr. Chairman, this is the crux of the matter. For a number of years the Congress has included in the appropriation bill a provision known as the emergency fund. The Congress traditionally gives \$150 million a year in emergency funds, not earmarked for any program, project or policy. It is for the President and the Secretary of Defense to use as they see fit to meet emergencies, to take care of breakthroughs, to handle any one of a multitude of problems which could not be foreseen when the budget was put together. In addition they have an extra \$150 million of transfer authority in the emergency fund. So they have \$300 million that can be utilized, providing they have additional authorization. But if you hamstring them authorizationwise then they cannot use the emergency fund to take care of the breakthroughs or problems relating thereto.

So, as I see the picture, it is perfectly sound to give a greater authorization providing we make no commitment at this time that money will be forthcoming

in an equal amount. This can be decided subsequently when we consider the appropriation bill.

May I conclude by saying this. Unfortunately I was not on the floor when several of my colleagues, both Republican and Democratic, made some comments concerning the Secretary of Defense and his administration of this vast and important program. I know the members of this committee have had differences with the Secretary of Defense. May I say that I have had differences with the Secretary of Defense. And if you read the testimony, which will be forthcoming shortly from our Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force you will find that we have had very serious differences, Mr. McNamara and I. On the other hand, I want to say without hesitation or qualification that in my judgment he is a most competent, conscientious, honorable, dedicated American citizen. We are extremely fortunate to have a man with those outstanding characteristics in the office of Secretary of Defense. Under no circumstances would I want these comments to be interpreted as an endorsement of all the recommendations or policies that he has submitted in the past or will for the future. I expect to differ with him many times. But such differences of opinion in no way detract from my admiration or respect for Bob McNamara. He is a fine, fine person doing a terribly tough job. It would be unfortunate for a man of this competence, this dedication and this patriotism to be pictured in the wrong light. I hope and trust, and I sincerely believe, that my colleagues who have spoken here today did not intend under any circumstances to create the wrong impression even though as members of the legislative branch they may differ and differ seriously with some of his recommendations.

In conclusion, despite my differences with the Secretary of Defense I believe he has handled a most difficult job commendably. I hope his decisions are sound because our future security rests on many of these judgments.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in the discussion on this bill I was asked to state some specifics on ways in which we could save tax dollars in the procurement account of the Department of Defense. First I would like to say that I concur in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORB]. I believe that it is a good idea for us to include authorizing language in this bill, a broad enough umbrella, so that if there are any breakthroughs as far as the RS-70 is concerned, we will be able to go forward with this program while the Congress is not in session.

The RS-70 program and also the two attack submarines could have been funded within the \$15.3 billion authorization request which was made by the President of the United States. The President requested a total overall figure of \$15.3 billion for procurement and R.D.T. & E. The Committee on

Armed Services has raised this amount to \$15.8 billion. This increase is subject to serious criticism which I have of this piece of legislation. I do not believe that any real effort was made in drafting this bill to establish the correct priorities within the \$15.3 billion authorizing request made by the President of the United States.

Let us look at this procurement budget of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the procurement authorization in this bill can be cut by forcing the Defense Establishment to go to more competitive bidding. Less than 40 percent of the total defense procurement is awarded on a competitive price basis at the present time.

Over 30 percent of the total prime contract awards are done on a wasteful cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

In the current fiscal year the Navy, on their own volition, struck from their shipbuilding program a nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate at a cost of almost \$200 million.

The General Accounting Office is constantly forwarding to the Congress examples of gross waste in procurement and procurement methods in the Department of Defense. We all remember, for example, the episode of not too long ago, when the Air Force bought large numbers of firetrucks when the Army was maintaining a large number in excess of their needs and which could have been used by the Air Force.

It is not unusual for one service to procure an item on a noncompetitive high-cost basis while another service is procuring the same or a similar item on a competitive basis at a much lower cost. For example, here is a report showing Navy purchase of certain aircraft engine bearings on a noncompetitive basis from the aircraft engine manufacturer while at the same time the Air Force had advised the Navy that these items could be purchased competitively at the cost of about one-third less than the price the Navy proposed to pay.

The complex and vast armed services procurement regulations need careful monitoring to see that they assure the Government obtaining the lower price from efficient procedures. This is not always the case. For example, here is a report with reference to the procurement of certain radio sets by the Army in which the lower bidder was disqualified for a technical reason resulting in a higher cost to the Government. The bidder in this case was disqualified because he did not properly list use of some \$14,000 worth of Government-owned property in his possession. The cost to the Government of awarding to the next producer was almost \$200,000.

The Hébert subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee over the past several years has pointed out time and again, as has the House Appropriations Committee, the need for more competitive purchases of aircraft spares and spare parts. You will remember many of their classic examples of where the services were purchasing costly parts when ordinary hardware types would have sufficed. Fortunately, these in-

vestigations have resulted in some savings in this area, but there is much remaining to be done.

Careful monitorship of costs presented to the Government is not always the case and requires much attention. The Navy awarded contracts to Westinghouse for pumps and casings for nuclear submarines at prices totaling \$8.7 million. Westinghouse subcontracted this to one of their own departments. Cost estimates prepared by the manufacturing department of Westinghouse indicated that prices \$2.2 million lower than those accepted would have covered costs and afforded a profit at the rate of 10 percent.

Of necessity the services award contracts for vast amounts of common type items, such as motor generators. Proper review is not being made in all instances of the inventory of many of these items prior to new purchases. For example, the Army proposed to purchase certain generator sets in the amount of \$6.3 million. Investigation by the General Accounting Office disclosed that in the Navy and Corps of Engineers inventory there were generators which could be used in lieu of this purchase. As a result, over \$6 million of available generators were found in stock to meet this requirement.

Another report with reference to the procurement of aircraft tires for the Air Force and Navy points out that in 1 year \$10 million could have been saved had the services followed competitive procurement for these tires as they had in the past.

Another report with reference to the procurement of AN/SPS 10 radar shows \$3.9 million wasted under original sole-source Navy procurement. Under subsequent open competition, original Navy-negotiated price dropped from \$40,000 per system price to \$17,083 per system price. Under original sole-source procurement, 242 units were bought at \$33,297 per system.

AN/SPS 10 radar: The Navy negotiated an original \$40,000 per system price with DuMont and Sylvania on this procurement. This price subsequently fell to \$17,083 per system when open competition was introduced, and Daystrom, Inc. won the contract. This represented a difference of 58 percent between high and low price. As examples, contract NObsr 52321 awarded a contract to Sylvania to produce 185 units at a price of \$27,000 per system, or a total price of approximately \$5 million. A subsequent award, NObsr 75399, was for 57 units at a total cost of \$1,898,620 or \$33,297 per unit. When Daystrom won its contract in open competition, the price dropped \$17,083 per unit, at which time a Bureau of Ships civilian employee, Dean S. Young, indicated in an official report that the successful bidder could not make a profit on the item. Subsequent procurement found the price in the same general area under conditions of open competition, indicating that sole-source procurement cost the taxpayers millions.

Summary: Using the price of \$33,297 per unit for a total of 242 units bought under sole-source procurement methods

mentioned above, the taxpayers paid out a total of over \$3.9 million more than necessary to buy this equipment, almost a 50-percent overall loss in this one instance. Even using the lowest sole-source price does little to brighten the picture, proving again that open competition serves the best interest of the taxpayer and prevents any possible duplicity by procurement agency employees.

Another report with reference to the procurement of AN/APS 88 airborne radar sets shows \$561,000 wasted. Original sole-source transaction had estimated price of \$32,000 per system. This was adjusted downwards to \$30,000 for a total of 51 systems, costing \$1,440,843. Subsequently, Navy advertised for 57 additional systems of same equipment. Under open competition, price became \$17,247 per system for 57 systems for a total cost of \$984,000. Thus, in first sole-source award, taxpayers lost a total of \$561,000 in inflated prices.

In the procurement of AN/PDR 43 radiac sets shows \$600,000 wasted needlessly. Electronic Products Co. of Mt. Vernon, N.Y., developed and produced 6 preproduction units and 44 production units for total award of \$87,195.76. Three follow-on awards on sole-source basis purchased substantial quantities at prices ranging from \$490 to \$657. When open competition was introduced, the price fell to \$247.20 and still later it dropped to \$217.53. Cost was thus reduced by some 60 percent. Under sole-source, Navy purchased 1,500 units with average price of \$600 per set for a total expenditure of almost \$900,000. Under open competition, it was established that these same sets could have been purchased for a total price of about \$325,000.

In the procurement of AN/WRT 1 and AN/WRT 2 radio sets shows some \$15 million wasted. Sole-source contract was awarded to Westinghouse Electric to develop the radio set. Then Westinghouse was awarded contract to produce 430 units at unit cost of \$29,725 for total contract price of \$12.8 million. Second procurement awarded to Westinghouse under sole-source contract also. This time for 617 radios at unit cost of \$19,200 with total cost of \$12.1 million. Under third procurement pressure from industry forced open competition. Unit price fell to \$10,497.52. Contract was awarded to Cosmos Industries, Inc.

It is ridiculous to state that in a procurement program as large as the one being discussed by the House today that there is no possibility of reducing these estimates. This is to say that the management of this vast organization is perfect, and that there is no room for improvement. Even the most partisan of people will admit this is not so. Continued improvement in this management of the defense procurement program will result in reductions in estimates such as we are considering today.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Wisconsin in his remarks a moment ago indicated what he meant by the "fat" in the bill

to which he referred yesterday. I am sure all of us share with him a desire to procure our necessary weapons of war at the lowest possible cost and to accomplish a maximum of efficiency in a defense procurement system.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a few minutes the problem of block obsolescence of the fleet. The Navy has displayed growing concern over this problem for the past several years and has repeatedly stressed the fact that we must have an adequate shipbuilding and conversion program if we are to maintain the combat effective Navy which is an absolute and fundamental requirement for our national survival.

This same concern, not surprisingly, has been felt and voiced by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. Indeed, his concern has become so great that last year he appointed a special subcommittee for the purpose of studying the composition of the fleet and the problems of block obsolescence of naval vessels.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] was appointed chairman of the subcommittee, and the other two members were Mr. BATES and myself.

The subcommittee issued a report which met with wholehearted agreement on the part of the full committee, and I call to your attention some very pertinent portions of that report quoted on pages 9 and 10 of the report which is before you today in support of H.R. 2440, the bill we are considering.

To put it mildly, the subcommittee report is not optimistic as to the future of our fleet. The evidence which we assembled caused a finding that our Navy is today headed toward block obsolescence—a block obsolescence that endangers our future.

This report states—and this was confirmed in hearings on the bill before us—that it is a statistical certainty—let me repeat that—a statistical certainty—that if we continue a shipbuilding program similar to that of the past few years, or indeed, at the rate of this year's program, or last year's program, our Navy will simply cease to exist as an effective military instrument.

The Navy is aware of this. The Secretary of Defense certainly should be aware of this. But in the last analysis, the responsibility lies with the Congress to determine the size and composition of our fleet and to provide the authorization and the funds to see that the fleet meets the needs of the country. The Navy, alone, cannot correct this situation—it can request ships of the Secretary of Defense, but if he says "No," that is final—and that is exactly what has happened.

We all realize that scientific and technological advances have had a revolutionary effect on ship design. These advances themselves accelerate the obsolescence of existing ships, but within the limits of funds and other practical considerations they must be incorporated in the new ships. We have authorized in previous programs many new ships designed to take advantage of these advances. Despite this, at the end of this

fiscal year—21 years after the start of World War II—70 percent of the active fleet will be ships designed for that war.

We have authorized modernizations of these ships where it has been economically feasible to do so. These improvements have paid dividends in the form of an increased mid-period readiness posture but the weight, space and power requirements of new weapons make it either uneconomical or impractical to carry this modernization program beyond its presently projected scope.

The future holds little prospect for a reduction in the Navy's worldwide commitments which would in turn permit a significant reduction in the number of ships in the fleet. We are, therefore, faced with the problem of replacing large numbers of outdated ships at a time when responsiveness to present combat requirements and installation of complex weapons systems are required to meet increasing threats.

Our authorizations of the past few years have contributed to the modernization of the fleet. We have seen accelerated construction and deployment of the impressive Polaris weapons system, which represents a classic example of the combination of advanced developments in hull, propulsion, and weapons into a completely integrated weapons system. We have observed the superior performance of our growing fleet of nuclear attack submarines, and this past year operations of the nuclear powered surface ships *Enterprise*, *Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge*, have been most gratifying.

Despite these noteworthy signs of progress in fleet modernization, by 5 years from now, or 23 years after the close of World War II, when all the ships previously authorized, but currently undelivered, and those contained in this authorization will have joined the fleet, approximately 49 percent of fleet strength at that time will still be World War II products. We are making meager headway against the relentless erosion of combat effectiveness by the currents of age and technology. We cannot wait 23 years more for the complete modernization of the remaining half of the Navy if we are to maintain it as a meaningful arm of our foreign policy, and as an effective agency of national defense. The Armed Services Committee did accelerate somewhat the advances to be achieved in this year's program by writing into this authorization bill two more nuclear powered attack submarines than were contained in the defense budget request.

I do not want to paint too gloomy a picture—though heaven knows it is black enough. This year's bill does provide for substantial increases in our deterrent posture through the programming of six additional Polaris submarines and supporting ships and craft. It enhances our ASW capabilities through the programming of 8 nuclear attack submarines, 10 improved ocean escorts, and the fleet rehabilitation and modernization—FRAM—conversion of 19 World War II destroyers. It advances the combined anti-air warfare and antisubmarine warfare capability of our strike forces through modernization of seven post-World War II destroyer types.

It also increases our amphibious strength through the construction of five ships and adds to our underway replenishment capabilities through both new construction and conversions. It increases our effectiveness in the field of counterinsurgency and paramilitary operations through the programming of six small, fast specially configured, motor gunboats designed for varied operations in shallow water, but also capable of operations in the open sea. It also provides for miscellaneous support through the programming of various support types. Included in these are three surveying ships which by gathering oceanographic environmental information will contribute to the effectiveness of future naval operations through increased knowledge of the oceans. Much of the data gathered also will be useful to other Government programs and to scientific research in various aspects of the national oceanographic research program.

At best, however, it is a lean program, actually an austere program. It has been slashed to urgent necessities and makes no real effort to forestall block obsolescence. Reluctantly I recommend its authorization as presented, with the added observation that with each year of just holding our own against the on-rushing tide of obsolescence we are merely putting off the day when we will either have to enter upon a truly stupendous shipbuilding program or accept the realities of an obsolete fleet—a Navy incapable of carrying out its mission, unable to project the power and influence of the United States into the far corners of the world. I must point out that only through large near-future increases in authorizations and appropriations can we offset the past and present neglect of naval ship replacement. Taking into account the extent to which needed new ship construction has been deferred, and the very special problems involved in the modernization of the Navy, we may as well prepare ourselves for an extensive and costly program of shipbuilding, and the longer we put it off the more expensive it is ultimately going to be.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to compliment and commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the House a subject which I consider to be of the utmost importance.

I would like to ask a question or two.

As I understand from what the gentleman has said and from what I read in the report of the subcommittee last fall, as well as this report, the Navy would like to construct more ships or have an authorization to construct them than is presently provided?

Mr. HARDY. Yes. They asked for additional ships this year, but that was denied by the Department of Defense.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It was suggested a minimum of 70 ships per year ought to be authorized over a period of 7 years?

Mr. HARDY. If we want a modern fleet, we would have to build at the rate of 70 ships per year.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. But according to a statement of the committee, even this would be a very conservative figure?

Mr. HARDY. That would be conservative.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. If we do not build more ships, and we reach the period when we will have to build a lot of them in a hurry, will they not cost more dollars than if we replaced them now?

Mr. HARDY. It would make awfully good sense to have a regular, steady flow of new ships coming in. We are converting ships as best we can, but we have reached the point where we have converted all we can economically. The only thing we have done is to put off the day when we will have to build new ones.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I heard a few minutes ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] outline three steps to be taken before the RS-70 could be a reality.

The Committee on Armed Services certainly acknowledges and approves the first two steps. That is, there will have to be an authorization by Congress; and, second, there will have to be an appropriation by the Congress through the Committee on Appropriations. However, it is not the position of our committee that the Executive has the right to deny the constitutional responsibility of the Congress of the United States to provide for the national defense. So it is not the position of our committee that the Executive has the right to repudiate duly enacted laws providing for an authorization and appropriation for the RS-70.

Let me state a few things about the RS-70.

First of all, I would like to say there are specific and sound reasons given in the report for the development of the extra two RS-70's. These are necessary to develop a weapons vehicle, otherwise we will have merely an experimental airplane which will not yet have weapons of value. If we obtain the two requested additions we will have the most effective and most outstanding reconnaissance vehicle in the armed services of any country. It will have air-to-ground missile strength. It will be able to cover preplanned targets and not yet precisely located targets. It will be able to cover mobile targets. It will be able to report back what it has seen. It would provide a cover under which so called limited or nonnuclear war could be waged. We all desire to obtain a limitation upon warfare if we can. Certainly nobody can desire war just for war's sake, and if we can limit warfare, so much the better, without destroying all of mankind.

The last point, made very effectively by the gentleman from Texas, is that this will require the Soviets to expend tremendous sums to try to provide anti-aircraft defense against this new weapons system.

In the back part of the report on this bill there will be found some very antagonistic remarks in regard to the RS-70. It is said that it has taken 10 years to develop; but it is suggested we should

embark upon some new program, which also might take another 10 years. It is said in the report that the striking capabilities are available today that were not available 10 years ago. Of course that is so. It is also true the RS-70 today contemplates those striking capabilities. This is not a question of going back to what the RS-70 was in the blueprint stage 10 years ago.

Opponents entirely overlook the reconnaissance value of this important development in our technological development.

With the single exception of General Taylor, already discussed, the proposal for fiscal year 1964 has the united support of the leading military authorities in the U.S. Government. I want to stress that the service chiefs, after exhaustive study of all pertinent information, are of the opinion that the RS-70 program should be accelerated by construction of the two additional prototype aircraft with associated radar and missile work.

To the contrary, we have Secretary McNamara's recommendation that a great slowdown in the development program is warranted, partly because other means may be available to accomplish the mission of postattack reconnaissance on remaining targets, with subsequent strikes upon them.

If these other means will be available and are as vastly superior to the RS-70 as the Secretary seems to think, why spend another cent on the RS-70? Yet he proposes to spend \$50 million of the extra \$192 million provided by the Congress last year for a purpose in which he seems to have no faith.

I think we should question the so-called alternative means. The Armed Services Committee was given only the sketchiest of information about new reconnaissance and strike means which the Secretary hopes will be available. These promises about future weapons developments are simply promises—and I, for one, can make no judgment when I lack the information on which one must be based.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force Chiefs, however, have had access to the same material on which Secretary McNamara bases his promise. Their conclusion is directly contrary to his.

It seems to me highly dangerous to reject the opinion of the highest military authorities on the RS-70 program when we have not been given a good reason to reject it. In saying this I am in no way criticizing Secretary McNamara, whom I consider to be an able, dedicated American. No man has ever been a better Secretary of Defense than he.

Mr. Chairman, on another subject I would also call attention to the testimony of the distinguished Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. George W. Anderson, before the House Armed Services Committee on the indispensability of the manned aircraft for the foreseeable future. Admiral Anderson stated that the Navy considers manned aircraft indispensable to control of the seas and support the Armed Forces of the United States.

Within the past few months we have seen manned Naval Air Force fighters gather the vital low level aerial photography confirming the rapid Soviet military buildup in Cuba. In the same period, our long-range manned aircraft played a major role in successfully keeping Soviet submarines under continuous surveillance and discouraged them from establishing a base in Cuba at the height of this buildup. Likewise, when it became necessary to cut off the Soviet input of weapons into Cuba, Naval patrol aircraft performed a vital role in the quarantine. After the threat subsided, again the Navy's long-range Lockheed Orions confirmed the removal by ship of the Soviet missiles when onsite inspections were denied.

Naval air units based in my home State of Florida had a primary responsibility throughout the entire Cuban crisis and I want to take this occasion to deliver a special accolade to them. I am especially proud that units stationed in Jacksonville, in my own district, were personally complimented by President Kennedy for their fine performance.

In every major confrontation of the Soviets since Korea, manned Naval aircraft have moved quickly to secure localized control of the air giving encouragement to our friends and deterring aggression—in the Taiwan Straits, Lebanon, Indochina, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba.

The new naval aircraft requested for authorization in this year's appropriation act are expensive. However, their increased performance gives them the necessary combat capability to cope with the best a potential adversary can bring to bear against us during the time frame in which they will be operated. These aircraft are among the finest in the world, but their superior capability does not compensate for the numbers experience has shown to be required if our Navy is to carry out its mission. As the Soviet march of technology continues, so must the capability of our naval aircraft increase to cope with this threat. There is no painless and cheap solution to the rising costs of aviation through a reduction in numbers.

This is a very austere budget for manned naval aircraft and it is the sense of the committee that the authorization for 681 of these aircraft, of which 90 percent are combatant, will provide the minimum acceptable level of procurement.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the vital role our Polaris submarines play in our national defense posture. The capabilities of this mobile, silent, invulnerable missile force are well known to you all. Today, however, I should like to point out the importance of their sister ships, the nuclear attack submarines, to the defense of our Nation.

Many of the exploits of these submarines have captured the imagination of the world in recent years. Since the first cruise on nuclear power by *Nautilus* in 1955, we have heard of the historic under-ice arctic cruises by *Nautilus*, *Skate*, *Sargo*, and *Seadragon*, the submerged navigation of the globe by *Triton*, and the performance of *Skipjack*, the fastest submarine in the world.

Each of these submarines is propelled by powerful, reliable, safe, nuclear powerplants unmatched by any other in the world, thanks to the brilliance, foresight, and dedication of Vice Admiral Rickover. The fact that these nuclear submarines have achieved a significant capability to accomplish their wartime mission—destruction of enemy ships, particularly submarines—is not so well known.

The Soviets are making a determined bid to challenge the free world's historic dominance at sea. The Soviets are racing to become a top-ranking maritime power and at the same time are continuing to expend a disproportionate amount of their resources in construction of modern submarines.

During World War II, U.S. submarines established a proud record in destruction of the enemy's mercantile fleet by accounting for well over one-half of tonnage destroyed. It can be anticipated that the submarine's effort in future conflicts will be equally effective if they are properly equipped to operate in a modern antisubmarine warfare environment. We have submarines with the capability to operate in any ocean area in the world in the *Thresher* class submarine.

The ability of these submarines and other antisubmarine forces to contain the Soviet submarine threat is of vital importance to us today. Since World War II, Soviet Russia has launched a concentrated submarine-building program which has resulted in an estimated force of over 400, the largest in peacetime history and larger than the German or United States forces during World War II which exacted tremendous losses. Included in this force are missile submarines capable of threatening the continental United States as well as long-range submarines capable of penetrating all vital sealanes and threatening our control of the sea. Most significant, however, are recent Soviet claims of large numbers of nuclear submarines in operation. Although the antisubmarine warfare capability of the U.S. Navy is far and away superior to any other in the world and is an effective system for combating the Soviet bloc diesel submarine threat, as proved during the Cuban crisis, the problem of containing large numbers of nuclear submarines in the event of war is a great one. Our modern nuclear submarines, exemplified by U.S.S. *Thresher*, promise to be most important members of the antisubmarine warfare team. *Thresher* is truly a formidable weapon. She is equipped with vastly improved sonars which permit detection of enemy submarines at great ranges. Her quiet nuclear propulsion plant permits her to utilize the submarine's primary advantage—that of stealth—yet permits the use of high continuous speeds when needed. She is capable of going deep into inner space to shield her from detection and attack and to take advantage of deep sound channels. She is equipped with acoustic torpedoes which are capable of successfully attacking a submarine even if it is running deep and quiet. By next year *Thresher* will be equipped with Subroc—a torpedo-

tube-launched ballistic missile which will be effective against enemy submarines at ranges of many miles.

Thresher and her sister nuclear attack submarines have conducted numerous realistic wartime exercises to develop the tactics and weapons necessary to detect, classify, and kill both diesel and nuclear submarines. Some of these exercises have been operations in coordination with other antisubmarine warfare ships and aircraft. Others have been submarine versus submarine operations to simulate wartime operations in a hostile environment such as the enemy's home waters where only a submarine can operate. Other exercises have been conducted in the one ocean where only nuclear submarines can insure control of the sea—the arctic ice pack. Only this past summer, *Seadragon* and *Skate* conducted dog fights under the arctic ice pack. The importance of developing a capability to defend our Nation against attack from enemy submarines approaching from the arctic was vividly shown by recent photographs of a Soviet nuclear submarine at the North Pole.

Operations of our nuclear submarines to date offer convincing proof that these weapons systems are a most important member of our anti-submarine-warfare team. They are the only member of the team which can conduct anti-submarine-warfare operations in the enemy's own element, safe from the vagaries of surface disturbances of the sea. Additionally, the nuclear submarine will continue in its role as the Nation's most potent weapon if attrition of the enemy's mercantile fleet is required.

Their potential in these most vital missions is virtually unlimited provided we maintain our lead over the Soviets in numbers and in combat capability.

We must continue to recognize the unique capabilities of these marvelous weapon systems if we are to retain the free world's capability to operate freely at sea anywhere we choose. The free world is composed of maritime nations. Only by keeping our sealanes open will we be able to prosper and survive, and only by maintaining a modern submarine force incorporating our latest technological advances, will we be able to maintain control of the sea in times of conflict.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is imperative that every penny of the proposed \$363,700,000 for the RS-70 bomber be allocated for the development of this most important project.

I believe it would be a dangerous step, both physically and psychologically, if the safety of the United States depended entirely upon the faultless operation of electronic equipment by completely disabling our manned bomber system.

I am completely in accord and wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the majority of his Armed Services Committee, and in fact, with the best military judgment available when they ask that "all reasonable doubt be removed in order to produce all the evidence that is needed upon which the Department of Defense and the Congress can base a rational

decision as to whether or not RS-70's should be produced in quantity."

It is incumbent upon every Member of this House to insure the lives of all its citizens, so it is imperative that all doubts concerning the potentiality of the RS-70 be removed, in order that we may begin positive action regarding the destiny of these United States in relation to our dependence for survival on electronic missile systems.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, we have read and heard many statements of late about our budget problems, plus existing and predicted deficits. Many are clamoring for fiscal policies that will reduce these deficits and make an income tax cut possible. With this in mind, how can we possibly recommend an increase in spending of almost a half-billion dollars, that will do nothing but add to the deficit? Such a move is particularly strange when you realize that this half-billion is over and above the amount actually requested.

In fact, we have noted from the committee report that in every instance the committee accepted the exact amount requested on every item, without attempting to reduce a single dollar in spending. Then the half-billion dollars was added to it.

In raising this objection, I am not necessarily pointing to the specified increases listed by the committee. Rather, I object to the total figure, which, it seems to me, could well have been adjusted to a point where it could have at least stayed within the requested total. If the new programs are necessary, surely there are other areas where reductions can be made to accommodate the new programs, some of which must duplicate or supersede activities in the original request.

It is hoped that the Appropriations Committee will take a long, healthy look at the figures in this bill. I hope these figures are examined thoroughly to determine whether or not the increases, totaling half-a-billion dollars, are really necessary.

We have heard many expressions of late, by knowledgeable and reputable people, that it is going to be possible to make reductions in the expenditures proposed under the 1964 budget requests. However, the action we are contemplating today hardly appears to be following the frugal pattern thus outlined.

In light of these points, I feel it is necessary to oppose this authorization until such time as the Appropriations Committee has had a chance to explore all phases of the military procurement program in the interest of an adequate defense system that is commensurate with prudent and proper Government expenditures.

We must replace our talk of economy with action. If we approve this authorization today, we may indeed do nothing except lay the whip to an inflationary horse that is already running away at full speed. If we are ever going to control our galloping budgets, someone must get hold of the reins.

For these reasons, I hope the House will sustain actions that will limit this authorization at least to the original recommendation.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the RS-70 should be developed beyond transportation level to weapons carrier and missile-launching platform and whatever other military purpose it can fulfill. There must be no gap between our present manned bomber system and a future fully capable missile program. Even at worse, we must leave no stone unturned in new weapons and also protect our present investment in RS-70.

As to the total bill, I must vote for recommitment to cut 5 percent from procurement and 12½ percent from research, development, test, and evaluation because I feel there is considerable padding, waste and inefficiency that can be cut from the bill. My proof may be found in four GAO reports and numerous examples of sole-source contracts of cost-plus-fixed-fee nature where specific sums were lost through improper procedures. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] provided some very interesting, detailed information on the award of contracts when he pointed out the improper procedures which have resulted in increased cost wherein cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts were placed rather than contracts awarded through competitive bids.

Examples of these procedures are described in GAO reports on first, Army generators purchase; second, Navy bearings; and, third, GSA aircraft tires. Other specific examples include the AN/SPS 10 radar \$3.9 million overpayment, AN/APS 88 airborne radar \$561,000, AN/PDR 43 radiac set \$600,000, AN/WRT 1 and 2 radio sets \$15 million. These sums were overpayment in prices between sole-source contracts and the lower prices of competitive bids; not known, however, are the untold amounts of those other contracts not awarded on competitive basis but awarded on cost plus fixed fee.

The 60 percent of contracts awarded without competitive bids cost us too much.

The views of Congressmen LAIRD and CURTIS include this material and suggestions to improve our contract award and reduction of spending to get more value per dollar expended.

As I see it, those for economy and fiscal responsibility must start with the authorization bill—rather than voting the authorization and waiting for the appropriation bill to stress fiscal responsibility. Too often at appropriation time we are told we must vote money for what was earlier authorized. Today, the recommitment cuts would not hurt our defense posture. On the contrary, we must zealously safeguard the expenditures and proper procedures. Our military strength is based on our economic strength. Fiscal responsibility is a must at all times.

Failing to take the responsible action outlined in the recommitment I could not consistently agree to final passage, and if the recommitment fails I shall vote against the bill. Under no circumstances does this mean I am opposed to military preparedness and these weapons. But I shall at the same time expect the greatest value received possible for every defense dollar.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I must, in good conscience, vote against the committee amendment which authorizes the expenditure of \$363 million for two additional RS-70 aircraft. I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not oppose the manned bomber concept. Certainly I do not. Nor am I opposed to continuing the work on the RS-70 concept.

But let us face it. We have already spent over a billion dollars and still do not have an RS-70 which will fly. It will take an additional billion dollars plus to go ahead with the additional two requested by this amendment. It may well be that the concept is worth while but, until we know it is going to be successful—and we will know since the development of the three now authorized will continue—I am not willing to sacrifice \$363 million of the taxpayers' money. The Air Force has not pushed for this money. The administration is opposed to spending this money at this time.

If I thought for one moment we were sacrificing even the smallest element of our national security I would not hesitate to authorize these funds but this is a project still in its development stage which has not been proven.

If, with three of these aircraft, we prove its feasibility and that it will make a substantial contribution to our national defense, then my vote will unhesitatingly be a vote for two and more of this type aircraft.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I support the additional committee authorization of funds for the RS-70 program. The development of the RS-70 system as an inventory item of the Air Force is a matter of prime economic interest to my district because the testing will be accomplished at Edwards Air Force Flight Test Center. I want to make this clear because my support of the project is not based on any such narrow ground. It is my judgment that a program which has already merited the appropriation of over \$1 billion should not be strangled slowly to death because the feasibility of certain components of it has not already been demonstrated. Aside from purely military values there are bound to be large benefits to commercial flying from development of an aircraft that can fly faster than a bullet and at altitudes in excess of 70,000 feet.

My main purpose in appearing here today is to comment on the Dyna-Soar program, which involves the development of a lift-type manned space vehicle and the appropriate booster to utilize it—in this instance the Titan III booster. Although this authorization bill contains some research and development authorizations for the Air Force it does not relate to the Dyna-Soar-Titan III program for the reason that at the moment it is not considered as an aircraft or missile system. As progress is made on it I think that it will be so considered. In any event omission from this bill does not denote a lack of progress. Funds for it are requested in the Air Force budget and I am hopeful that the Congress will approve that request.

Finally, I would like to point out that although the report which accompanies

this bill specifically identifies certain projects for research and development, that listing is not exclusive. Other unlisted projects are covered by a general authorization of research and development funds which were supported by the military services before the committee. Included in such funds are funds for the Navy. I have a particular interest in this fact because the naval ordnance test station is in my district and they have some 200 projects in various postures of research and/or development.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1964 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

PROCUREMENT

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, \$522,100,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, \$1,958,700,000; for the Air Force, \$3,559,000,000.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, \$580,700,000; for the Navy, \$1,107,300,000; for the Marine Corps, \$14,700,000; for the Air Force, \$2,177,000,000.

Naval vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, \$2,444,000,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, \$82,148,000; for the Navy (including the Marine Corps), \$204,183,000; for the Air Force, \$686,686,000 of which amount \$363,700,000 is authorized only for research, development, and test of the RS-70.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, \$576,601,000; for the Navy (including the Marine Corps), \$590,133,000; for the Air Force, \$1,060,132,000.

Naval vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, \$293,008,000.

Mr. STRATTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. At what point may one move to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill consists of but one section, and under the rule the entire bill must be read without interruption.

(The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 11, strike out "\$2,310,000,000" and insert "\$2,444,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not reach some agreement as to time on this committee amendment, which involves two nuclear-type submarines classified as killer submarines.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I would make this point, that the Committee on Armed Services has had practically all the time in debate, and there are some of us that would like to have a few words to say about the general bill.

Mr. VINSON. I will be generous in the time, but I am just wondering if we could not reach some agreement.

Mr. CURTIS. Why not wait until we have a little debate, I suggest to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman have 10 minutes or 5 minutes or whatever time he wants, but let us do it in an orderly way and make progress.

Mr. CURTIS. That is all right, but this is an important bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on the first amendment, on line 11, page 2, of the bill, debate shall not exceed 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CURTIS. I object, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know that everyone in this House is deeply concerned about the defense of our country and maintaining the preeminent position of the United States throughout the world.

However, very little has been said about one aspect of our position in this world today. We can very easily become a second-rate power, not through letting down on our military defense, but by letting down in our responsibilities in the fiscal area.

Permit me to say that it is not idle gossip to think that the dollar might be devalued. Indeed, if we continue on this course of deficit financing that can well come about. In fact, some advisers close to the President have already suggested that this might be the course. I say we have to get into the expenditure side of the budget. We have got to think in terms of what can we afford. Up to the present time there has been very little attention devoted to that in the debate. I might say that it has been very difficult to even follow what the Committee on Armed Services has presented to us. The some 1,300 pages of printed hearings are not even indexed so that the Members of the House can follow with some intelligence what might be in this bill. The entire time for debate has been absorbed by the members of this committee, with very little explanation to the Members of the House, I might state, in the way

of where this money might be spent. The committee's written report deals with two areas of controversy both increasing the overall \$15 billion authorization sought in this bill. What about the base \$15 billion? We are distracted by the discussion over the \$500 million increases. Permit me to relate this to our fiscal picture. We had an \$81 billion expenditure rate the year before President Kennedy came into office. The first year he was in office that expenditure rate went up to \$87 billion. This year it is going to be \$94 or \$95 billion. The President's projected expenditure rate for the next fiscal year is \$99 billion. This is an \$18 billion increase in the space of 3 years compared to—just as a comparison—the previous 6 years of an increase of \$13 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the President's proposal for tax reductions—and heaven knows we need them because our tax structure is creating economic damage—must be in my judgment predicated upon expenditure reform. I have suggested that the expenditure rate must be kept to around \$95 billion for the next 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, the only way we can look into the future is to see what the proposals are in this present budget containing requests for new obligational authority. This is not expenditure. This is an authorization bill paving the way for new obligational authority. New obligational authority requests under the 1964 budget are \$107 billion. Here is where the amount of this particular bill we have before us would be included. If we are going to hold this expenditure line for the future, we must deal, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] pointed out, with all the three steps in the appropriations process. We must look at each step, the first step being authorization like this bill, then the new obligational authority, and then the expenditure rate. Let no one tell you here that the authorization to ask for new obligational authority we are talking about is money that is going to be spent largely in 1963 or 1964. It is projected on out into the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, nowhere in the committee report, I might say, does the committee give us the carryover obligational authority voted from previous years that is unspent and some not even obligated so that we might be able to get the entire picture. I know the total budget figure. There will be \$87 billion of obligational carryover as of June 30 of this year of which the military share will be the largest item. Then add to the \$87 billion carryover the President's request for \$107 billion new obligational authority and you will have the figure of \$194 billion of authority to spend the President will have for fiscal year 1964. It is only the President's statement that he will actually spend only \$99 billion in fiscal year 1964 leaving a carryover of \$95 billion on June 30, 1964. The Congress, once it has voted authorization and appropriation has no control over the expenditure rate; this is the prerogative of the Executive. So we, the Congress, must get into this aspect of the expenditures. If we are to control spending, consider aggregate levels and the priorities of the

components we must do so on authorization bills, such as this one, as well as on the appropriation bills.

There is very little, I repeat, for the House to go on, contained in the committee report.

One cannot get into the committee hearings with any clarity because there is no index for the 1,300 pages it contains. However, fortunately, there have been some studies made of this area in particular by experts in this field; as expert, I might say, as the members of the Committee on Armed Services who have failed in this instance to take the rest of the Members of the House into their confidence. On the basis of the outside studies, done by Members of the House—if I am recognized for the purpose—I am going to offer a motion to recommit to cut this particular authority to spend, this authorization bill, by 5 percent in the procurement section, except for U.S. naval torpedoes, and by 12.5 percent in the research and development area. This will amount to a total cut of approximately \$800 million. This will not cut the two committee amendments if adopted because under the rules of the House the motion to recommit with instructions cannot amend amendments.

Let me say to my colleagues that if in your judgment we must have Federal expenditure reform, now is the time and place to begin. It does no good to put off the day of reckoning to say let us do the cutting elsewhere, and at another time.

We can wait no longer. If we pursue the fiscal course we are pursuing—deficit financing on up to at least 1972 with an additional \$75 billion of debt to market, the dollar will be devalued whatever may be our wishes. Then the United States will no longer be the preeminent nation in the world; we will no longer be the world's banker. We will take our place still powerful, but no longer preeminent or the master of our destiny, along with other nations which once had their day of preeminence.

Yes, we must talk in terms of military defense. But we must also talk in terms of economic strength from whence we derive our military strength.

We have been debating neither military strength nor sound budgets—only whether we should trust the judgment of a committee which shies away from debate and showing its studies and working papers whereby the House membership might evaluate the judgment.

A recommittal motion is the only recourse open to those of us who feel expenditure reform is vital to our national security. I am satisfied that this kind of discipline is necessary. There is plenty of time in the event this cut happens to be in error in any detail—and I do not like the across-the-board approach, but if this is in error in any detail although sound study reveals it is not, let me assure you that there is plenty of time to get into any detail of this matter to correct it. But if this Congress does not begin at this point, the beginning of the expenditure process to move in on the matter of this authority for new obligatory authority, we have lost this first chance and all this talk

against deficit financing and for balanced budgets will be idle.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this first amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this first amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the committee amendment. I am also going to support the committee's position on the RS-70. But during this debate we have heard a lot about the obsolescence of the fleet, about the RS-70, and about the two additional attack submarines. As I sat on the committee for weeks I heard of other programs that would be very desirable. All of this indicates that if you wanted to you could add several billion dollars to this authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] for the honesty of his presentation. It is coincidental that he talked to the same matter to which I want to address myself, because I think the House should know, should have an honest presentation of what this bill actually does. We do not want to turn on the radio tomorrow and hear the minority leader claim that we are going to reduce the defense budget by \$3 billion, because we have a situation to meet and I think the House will fulfill its responsibility in meeting our national security needs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read a response to an inquiry directed to the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the effect of the new obligatory authority and expenditures in 1964 of our committee action. I supported the committee. But I think we should be honest in what we do in the House and that the Members should know exactly what they are doing in the House.

The Director of the Budget advises:

The committee, in reporting out this bill, recommended an increase of about a half a billion dollars above the amount requested by the President for authorization. Of this amount \$367.7 million is for the RS-70. I am going to support this. I want to be honest with the House. But I also want the House to know exactly what it is doing so that they may take deliberate action.

One hundred and thirty-four million dollars is for two additional nuclear-powered submarines. That is in the amendment that we are considering now and which I am going to support.

Should this bill be enacted into law and Congress provide funds to finance these additions it would have the effect of adding half a billion dollars to new obligatory authority in the President's 1964 budget and if these funds were fully used by the Department of Defense it would add \$200 million to the expenditures estimated for 1964.

It is our understanding—

And this is from the Bureau of the Budget—

that the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services that considered H.R. 3006 has recommended that certain adjustments be made in the administration's bill as submitted to the Congress. The bill as proposed by the subcommittee would have the effect of adding \$278.7 million to the annual cost of the legislation as proposed by the administration. If we assume the effective date of the pay increases will be October 1, 1963, the same date assumed in the 1964 budget, the more liberal provisions proposed by the subcommittee would increase the 1964 budget by \$208 million in new obligatory authority and \$205 million in expenditures.

However, it is our understanding that the subcommittee is proposing that the effective date of the bill be the first day of the month following enactment, rather than October 1, 1963. If the legislation were to become effective on July 1, 1963, NOA requirements would be increased by an additional \$379 million and expenditures by \$372 million.

In summary, the total estimated effect of these additions could be to increase NOA requirements by \$1,084.7 million, and budget expenditures and the deficit by \$777 million as follows:

[In millions of dollars]		
	New obligatory authority	Expended
RS-70 and nuclear submarines.	497.7	200
Military pay:		
Effective Oct. 1, 1963.....	208.0	205
Addition if effective, July 1, 1963.....	379.0	372
Total.....	1,084.7	777

Thus the enactment of this legislation in the form discussed above would constitute a major breach of the President's 1964 budget.

Also, the additional expenditure effect of the subcommittee report on H.R. 3006 beyond the administration's proposal for military compensation increases would, if effective July 1, 1963, increase our balance-of-payments deficit in fiscal 1964 by \$50 to \$60 million.

If I can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

KERMIT GORDON,
Director.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that yesterday an unfortunately partisan note was entered into the RECORD. Here is a statement by the distinguished minority leader. On page 4010, he asked:

If the military posture and the situation of the United States in the world today is so much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, why is it that the defense budget under Eisenhower was \$40 billion a year, but now we have got to have \$50 billion a year?

This is a very strange question. I submit that the reason the military posture of the United States is so good is that we have at long last faced up to our responsibilities and are spending the money it takes to do what has to be done.

Last year we spent, out of \$94 billion, over \$50 billion for defense, unanimously. We spent \$3.5 billion for space, unanimously. We spent \$5.5 billion for vet-

erans' affairs, and I believe that was unanimous.

I will vote for this bill today, and I will not go home and bleat about the high rate of spending. It seems to me that those who support the spending programs most vigorously are the ones who wail the loudest about how high the cost of government is today. We act responsibly but we talk irresponsibly. I suppose that is better than the opposite situation.

If you want salted peanuts from the machine, you have to put in the penny and if we want adequate defense we simply must spend billions. We must say to the American people, "There are certain things that have to be done. If you want defense it costs billions of dollars." I believe the American people are mature enough and responsible enough to back us up on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 17, strike out "\$322,986,000" and insert "\$686,686,000 of which amount \$363,700,000 is authorized only for research, development, and test of the RS-70."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment relating to the RS-70's, which has been discussed very thoroughly. In view of the fact that there has been considerable discussion, and that practically all of the 4 hours was used in debating this matter, I think it would be proper now to limit debate. I do not want to be generous. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON) there were—ayes 66, noes 91.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege the other day of listening to and seeing a very wonderful movie, "The Longest Day," which recounts the D-day operations on the coast of Normandy. Those of you who saw it may recall that about 12 hours before the invasion was to take place, the radio reported the reading of a poem which went something like this: "In the dolorous doldrums of spring, a leaf has fallen."

Or something like that which symbolized in code the fact that the invasion was about to start.

A few moments ago the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] took the well of the House and in code conveyed the message to his colleagues

on the Republican side of the aisle that in spite of all the talk about reducing expenditures, and in spite of all the talk about cutting the Defense budget, it was perfectly okay with the leadership to vote for increasing the authorization bill because he was going to see to it that it would be cut in the Appropriations Committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we had a very eloquent talk here a moment ago by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] who pointed out to the Members of this body, as he always does so eloquently, our basic responsibilities as Members of this legislative body. He said we cannot just rubberstamp the recommendations of the executive department. He said we have to exercise our responsibility. Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the height of irresponsibility to urge in a serious vein, whether it is in code or in any other way, that those who are opposed to excessive spending will receive some kind of dispensation here today if they vote for increasing military authorizations and just leave it up to the boys on the Committee on Appropriations to wield the meat ax later on. It seems to me our decision and our responsibility as Members of this House applies just as much to a consideration of an authorization bill as it does with reference to an appropriation bill. If we are going to discharge our duty and exercise our authority and fulfill our responsibility as Members of Congress, then we have to vote against unnecessary increases in authorization bills, just as much as we would do in the case of appropriation bills.

We are not against the exercise of responsibility by the Congress. As a matter of fact, the five members of the committee who filed additional views supported the earlier amendment to authorize two additional nuclear submarines because this is an expenditure which will result in an increased and more effective deterrent force and will increase our capability to deal with the Soviet threat.

The effectiveness of these submarines was demonstrated during the Cuban crisis. But we who oppose this RS-70 amendment are opposed to unnecessary spending for an aircraft that is not yet even able to fly, for an aircraft that is not wanted by the Air Force as a part of our basic strategic nuclear deterrent force, and for an aircraft that in order to be transferred into even an effective secondary and support weapons system still requires the development of sophisticated electronic gear that has not even yet been invented.

So I say to you that in that situation nothing surely is going to be harmed as to the defense of our Nation if we defer these additional expenditures for 1 more year. We still have \$81 million available this year, after all, with which to work for further development of that gear. So let us defer these massive expenditures proposed in this amendment until next year when perhaps the fiscal situation will be a little bit better than it is at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude with one more comment. I have been a

little disturbed by the references that have been made here to the Secretary of Defense, and I am glad that my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] came to his support a moment ago. We have talked for years in this body, after all, about having a Secretary of Defense who had the courage to make difficult decisions; and, incidentally, when you get into the field of defense all the decisions are difficult. We had a distinguished industrialist as Secretary of Defense a few years ago by the name of McElroy, who pleaded with the Congress to "hold his feet to the fire" so that he would have an incentive to make some of these difficult decisions. I think we can be grateful today that we have a Secretary of Defense who is not only willing to make decisions, but who has the courage when he makes the hard decisions to stick by them when the flak begins to fly. This Secretary of Defense of ours has the complete confidence of the President of the United States, and I think it ought to be clear that if you vote for the committee amendment here today you are voting against the President of the United States, you are voting against the administration, and you are voting to increase the very expenditures which the administration itself is trying to hold down.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I shall not take a good deal of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, it has just been brought to my attention that in a speech this forenoon before the Advertising Council, Secretary of Defense McNamara charged my criticism of his dictatorial methods as being irresponsible.

He admits to arbitrarily cutting the original budget requests of the respective services. Such cuts have been made by every Secretary of Defense but not arbitrarily. But when Secretary McNamara says that I, as ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee, am acting irresponsibly in restoring two items—the RS-70 bomber program and two additional killer submarines—he is saying in effect that our entire House Committee on Armed Services of 36 members is irresponsible.

This is committee action, not mine alone. This weapons procurement bill was reported out of our committee unanimously.

The Secretary of Defense apparently has not read the committee report on this bill and the reports of our committee on other matters under his jurisdiction.

In a choice between the military recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the arbitrary decisions of the Secretary of Defense, our committee abides by the considered judgment of the Joint Chiefs.

Our committee is opposed to having a single chief of staff in uniform. We are also opposed to having a single chief of staff in civilian attire. That is the role Secretary McNamara presumes to be rightfully his. And apparently anyone who disagrees with him—the Joint

Chiefs of Staff or the Armed Services Committee—is in his opinion irresponsible.

Both Democrats and Republicans on our committee object to his overruling and bypassing our Joint Chiefs on military matters affecting the security of this country. Both Democrats and Republicans on our committee object to his deliberately ignoring the will of Congress.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, frankly, I think neither my colleague from Illinois nor the Secretary of Defense need an advocate here to protect them. The discussion we have had here on this matter has generated a good deal of heat and very little light. Certainly those on the committee know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] performs in a responsible manner as a Member of the House and as a member of the Armed Services Committee. I happen to be one of those who also believes that the Secretary of Defense is acting in a responsible manner, although in this particular instance I am in disagreement with the Secretary.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. It seems to me this thing should be put into perspective. We all appreciate the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but it was the Congress that gave the Secretary of Defense his authority. If he should not have any authority to recommend in the field of military procurement, we should take his power to make recommendations away from him and confine it to a military agency exclusively. I think it is up to the Congress to decide what to do with the recommendations of the administration. I think the Congress has the right to take the view of either the Joint Chiefs of Staff or of the Secretary. But I am certain that the Secretary has been acting within the province of his office when he made this recommendation.

Mr. PRICE. I agree with the gentleman.

I also think the gentleman from Illinois was acting in a responsible manner as a legislator as I am in opposing this particular decision on the part of the Secretary. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] put it very well a moment ago when he said that this Congress for years was crying for a Secretary of Defense who had the courage to make difficult decisions. Now we have one. I have, in the Committee on Armed Services, heard compliments paid to the Secretary of Defense for his great ability and because of his courage in making decisions. The fact I disagree with him in this instance does not lower my estimate of his ability or capability or his patriotism.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I understand the gentleman fully supports the committee decision?

Mr. PRICE. That is correct, on both amendments, the two nuclear attack submarines and the RS-70. As a matter of fact, I would go further than the committee did. I would recommend a nuclear-powered aircraft project.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has been on the committee for sometime?

Mr. PRICE. Yes, I have; for all but 1 year of the committee's existence.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman, I am sure, shares the confidence that we all have in the distinguished chairman of this committee?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; and every member of our committee does.

Mr. BOGGS. Would the gentleman say that the committee made a diligent study of the recommendations made by the administration?

Mr. PRICE. It certainly did. It studied the matter item by item for weeks.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman concluded that the administration had underestimated rather than overestimated the amount of money needed for the Defense Establishment?

Mr. PRICE. I would think so.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman supports the program which calls for an additional authorization of almost a half billion dollars?

Mr. PRICE. Yes, I support it, but the House should know exactly what the situation is.

Mr. BOGGS. Did I gather correctly that the Members on the Republican side supported it unanimously as well?

Mr. PRICE. It was a unanimous vote in committee on this legislation.

Mr. BOGGS. So that on the first major authorization bill to come before the House it is discovered that instead of the President being fiscally irresponsible, he has underestimated, according to this committee, by a half billion dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. PRICE. That appears to be the case, particularly in this instance.

Mr. BOGGS. Has the gentleman heard statements made by some Members of this body that the defense budget can be cut by \$3 billion?

Mr. PRICE. I do not know of anyone who has sat in this House for the past month who has not heard them.

Mr. BOGGS. Did the gentleman hear the minority leader make that statement?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; I heard him, not only on the floor but in public speeches and public appearances on the radio and television.

Mr. BOGGS. There have been some reports in the press that in the consideration of the military pay bill, which I am happy to say I support—I think it is long overdue—the debate will be on its not being enough rather than being too much. In other words, an effort will be made to increase the amount requested by the President.

Mr. PRICE. I am not a member of that subcommittee, but I understand that the proposal of the committee would increase the estimate of the Department

of Defense; yes. Like you, I am a staunch supporter of the military pay increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Now, if this authorization is approved—and mind you, I am not being critical, because I have the highest regard for this committee, and I have worked very closely with a lot of members of the committee, particularly the chairman, and I know that he is anything but fiscally irresponsible—

Mr. PRICE. I say that the committee acted, in my opinion, in a very responsible manner.

Mr. BOGGS. But if we adopt this authorization and we come along with an increase in the authorization for military pay and then we talk about a reduction of \$3 billion in defense, we would then have to reduce it \$4 billion to come back to the original starting point.

Mr. PRICE. To do both, we will have to be magicians.

Mr. BOGGS. All this demonstrates the question of who is being fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. Does the administration support these two amendments?

Mr. PRICE. No; the administration did not recommend them.

Mr. FOREMAN. Do they support it now?

Mr. PRICE. No; it does not support either amendment. I will say, however, certainly the Department of the Navy gave its blessing to the addition of two attack submarines. But we are not bound 100 percent to the recommendations of the administration. I stated at the outset that in my opinion the committee acted in a very responsible fashion, responsible manner, and I supported both amendments.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Louisiana, when he referred to this side of the House and the position that we will take on this bill, I think assumed a great deal by his comment that every Member on this side of the aisle is going to support this bill as reported out of the House Committee on Armed Services. I would like to state that there are a good many of us on this side of the aisle—

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield to any Member for a question but not for a speech.

Mr. LAIRD. Well, I thought the gentleman had yielded to the gentleman from Louisiana for a speech, and I

thought his statement required an answer.

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman from Louisiana did a masterful job in questioning.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Would the gentleman be willing to express, with any degree of confidence, his opinion on whether or not if we did, this afternoon—as I hope we do not approve this amendment—but if we do, that the Committee on Appropriations will fund the money.

Mr. PRICE. Well, of course, I would not dare to speak for the Committee on Appropriations. I have trouble enough when I want some little item for my district.

Mr. Chairman, since the beginning of time every weapon has had its counter-weapon of defense.

Undoubtedly, prior to the bow and arrow, there were no shields. Prior to the Gatling gun, or machinegun, troops moved in close compact order, but the rapid fire of the Gatling gun required the spread of these troops over a large area. The airplane in most recent times brought on the development of the anti-aircraft gun; and as the airplane became faster and more sophisticated, so did the ground defenses.

The development of the RS-70 and its ultimate production, if such appeared to be the course the country should follow, would cost a great deal of money. What is not realized, however, is that it would cost the Soviet Union very much more money to counter the very existence of the RS-70.

This money would have to be spent by the Soviet Union, perhaps some \$10 to \$20 billion, to develop anti-aircraft defenses to counter the threat of the RS-70. These defenses would include not only entirely new concepts in rocketry but a whole new family of fighter interceptor airplanes.

The anti-aircraft capability of the Soviet Union today could not even begin to counter an airplane with the capabilities of the RS-70. The tremendous expenditures which it would cause the Soviet Union to make would have to be made, I want to make it entirely clear, regardless of whether the RS-70 ever was actually used. These expenditures would place a tremendous drain on the Soviet economy. Ultimately, it is entirely possible that some years after the RS-70 was a completed weapons system, the Soviets would develop some means of countering it. That has always been true with respect to any weapon—some counterweapon is finally found.

I do not mean to convey the impression that I would recommend the building of the RS-70 merely because it would cause the Soviet Union to spend vast sums of money to counter it. The RS-70 as an airplane can stand by itself and justify itself as a manned system of tremendous capability for our country. But I do not think that we should lose sight of this great collateral benefit

which would flow from its very existence. The billions of dollars, the scientific effort, the consumption of goods, and the intensity of research and utilization of manpower which would be required to counter the RS-70 is an extremely valuable collateral benefit which would flow to the United States.

Keep the Soviets busy in this area and they will have neither the resources, the time, nor the funds to be developing other weapons which could be used against us.

Now I would like to make some reference to the question asked by the minority leader during debate on this bill yesterday and give him a very simple answer to his query. His question was: "If the military posture and the situation of the United States in the world today is so much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, why is it that the defense budget under Eisenhower was \$40 billion a year, but now we have got to have \$50 billion a year?"

The answer is a simple one, which I am certain, the gentleman from Indiana understands.

Our military posture is much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, and our defense is more balanced and flexible than it was 2 or 3 years ago.

This did not occur by accident. When President Kennedy was inaugurated, one of his first acts was to evaluate our capability to meet the challenge of both a conventional type of war and a nuclear war. President Kennedy decided at the beginning of his administration that it was necessary to have effective flexibility in military.

He found it necessary to increase the Defense budget. The results show in these improvements in our defense posture:

First. A 570-percent increase in our counterinsurgency forces.

Second. Increase in our general purpose forces from 11 to 16 Army combat divisions and provided air mobility to transport those divisions quickly to a threatened area.

Third. Increase in our tactical Air Force fighter wings from 16 to 21 to support and supply our ground forces and defend our operations.

Fourth. Advanced our Polaris submarine program by 18 months.

Fifth. Increased total number of strategic delivery vehicles 52 percent and increase in the number of planes on alert by 90 percent.

Sixth. Began a modernization of military airlift, providing jet transports for the first time and increasing numbers of aircraft.

Seventh. Stepped up modernization of Army.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, these facts provide an adequate answer to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I suppose in view of the fact that so many Members have made the statement that merely because they disagree with Secretary of Defense McNamara does not mean that they have any low regard for the man that I

should say as one of the members who signed the statement of additional views that the mere fact that I disagree with the majority of the members of the Committee on Armed Services does not mean that I do not respect the competence and ability of the majority of the committee. I am in favor of H.R. 2440. I am opposed to any percentage cuts across the board as was proposed earlier this afternoon. I do not think that represents any intelligent way to effect economy. However, I do not feel that this House is justified in adopting this committee amendment adding \$363 million and ultimately calling for better than \$1 billion for two additional RS-70's. I think that many people mistakenly believe that those who are not in favor of this amendment are against the continuation of the manned bomber. May I take this opportunity to emphasize that the failure to go forward with two additional RS-70's does not mean the end of manned aircraft. Every member who signed the additional views recognized the indispensable need for manned bombers. We shall continue to have a need for manned aircraft for the foreseeable future. We must have, and we are planning manned reconnaissance aircraft for both strategic and tactical purposes. We must have and are planning manned fighter bombers in great quantity.

Furthermore, it is completely inaccurate and misleading to think of the RS-70 as a bomber in the conventional sense of the term. The RS-70 is not designed to drop bombs but, rather, to launch missiles. All agree that a strategic aircraft which drops gravity bombs will be of very little use in the 1970's.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is, therefore, not between bombers and missiles. The real controversy is between a particular kind of air-based missile-launching platform on the one hand and another type of missile-launching platform on the other hand; in other words, between land-based or sea-based platforms on the one hand and air-based platforms on the other hand.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that Secretary McNamara is right. The proposal just will not stand a cost-effectiveness analysis, particularly in view of the better than \$300 billion debt which we now have and the tremendous deficit we face this year. This, I suggest to the members of the minority, is an excellent chance for the economy-minded Member to actually accomplish economy rather than merely talk about it.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret the turn that this debate has taken today. It is unfortunate that in a speech downtown today the first stone was cast and those of us on our side were forced to defend a personality whom we admire and respect and the majority was likewise put in the position of having to defend a personality whom they, too, admire and respect. It is unfortunate because the entire issue is, in my opinion, beside the point. The place to economize is in the bill that appropriates the

money; the appropriation bill. I think that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] made a most persuasive and logical argument this afternoon, that the Committee on Appropriations must have a flexible area within which they can operate.

Insofar as cutting the budget overall is concerned, I regret very much that the question of military pay has been raised. This seems to signal an effort to display Republican efforts at economy as inconsistent with support by Armed Services Committee Republicans for a much needed increase in military pay. Such attempts are certainly not in the best interests of our underpaid military men. There will be numerous opportunities this year for economies to be voted without engaging in the false economy of underpaying our military men who are prohibited from any lobbying activity. I hope partisanship will not lead to the tired technique of asking questions like "Have you stopped beating your wife?" We Republicans can support a stronger national defense, and higher military pay and still economize. As we vote on appropriations bills the remainder of this year the Republican Party will write a record of real, not false economy.

Speaking of flexibility, if you will remember, a couple of years ago, there was the possibility, at least a temporary possibility, that we were going to terminate the Polaris program at the 29th submarine. I stood in the well of this House and argued that if we did not authorize 6 additional submarines in that bill a couple of years ago and because of the realities of long lead-time we would be forced into a Polaris missile gap, and there would be a gap between the delivery of the 29th boat and the 30th. I was voted down. But a very few months later the Department of Defense realized that we needed to continue the Polaris missile program through the 41st boat, and so they came back to this Congress through reprogramming actions, and through subsequent authorizations the end strength proposed is now 41 boats. Fortunately the action was timely and the gap is slight. But the fact remains that there will be a delivery gap between the 29th Polaris boat and the 30th, because Congress would not authorize 6 additional Polaris submarines which the Navy did not have to build and the Appropriations Committee did not have to fund. And when the 29th submarine comes off the ways and you wait 3 months for the 30th, instead of 1 month, remember that it was the failure of the Congress to authorize and to give flexibility and a realistic ceiling on the building of Polaris boats which is responsible.

This argument applies today to the RS-70. It is my considered opinion that if you do not give us five RS-70 aircraft you might as well give us none because all you are doing with three is to develop a commercial airframe. That item would properly belong in an authorization for the Federal Aviation Agency as the development of a commercial airplane. We are interested in a military

bill and in developing a military weapons system. That is what the fourth and the fifth planes are for.

So I urge you to be realistic. Give us five because if you do not, you might as well strike them all out and move the three RS-70's we are authorizing over into the budget for the FAA.

I stick with the committee. We went into this at great length. We were deliberate about it. Do not run the risk of building a gap into the manned aircraft program as we did in the Polaris program.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are in opposition to the amendment. May I say that with all of the argument that has gone on in favor of the committee amendment, I regret to say I have heard nothing thus far in the debate this afternoon that would persuade any of us to change our position. Rather, however, since the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am more convinced than ever of the correctness of our position.

We are serving on a great legislative committee. It seems to me that when we come in with recommendations we should come in with recommendations for authorizations of moneys which will be seriously considered and acted upon soberly. It has been indicated here, and I think it is pretty obvious, that it is very doubtful that money will be appropriated. I would almost be willing to predict that if this bill passes today it will not be appropriated. Moreover, I certainly think that, unless there is some breakthrough which is not foreseeable in the immediate few months, it is doubtful whether, if appropriated, the money would be used.

I should like to confine my remaining remarks to rebuttal. There has been great discussion about an RS-70 weapons system—the fact that this is going to be a weapons system.

I should like to remind the members of the committee of what I said in reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the other day. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have taken a position on this, however, for quite different reasons and certainly not for a weapons system necessarily. I refer you to my colloquy with Admiral Anderson, which appears on pages 974-975 of the hearings and on page 4014 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Among other things, he made the following admission at the conclusion of our colloquy:

Mr. COHELAN. Well, do you think it is better as a reconnaissance system or as a strategic retaliatory system?

Admiral ANDERSON. [Deleted.]

Mr. COHELAN. In other words, that is what your major—

Admiral ANDERSON. That is my major concern.

Mr. COHELAN. Your major concern with the B-70.

And is that reflected in the Navy's request?

Admiral ANDERSON. This is—I would like to make my position clear.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very important question. Answer that question, Admiral.

Admiral ANDERSON. Sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Answer his question, right on that point.

Admiral ANDERSON. The Navy—

Mr. COHELAN. You are asking for 700 aircraft this year and a good many of them are [deleted].

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. COHELAN. You are interested in reconnaissance?

Admiral ANDERSON. Oh, very definitely, yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. COHELAN. Now Admiral, I don't want to put any words in your mouth, but is it fair for me to assume that in your judgment on the question at the time you made your decision, at the meeting of the Joint Chiefs, that your major interest in the system is in the [deleted] of the system, is that right?

Admiral ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. COHELAN. OK.

So I am suggesting to you here that each of the services no doubt had different reasons for taking the position they did in reference to this R. & D. program on the B-70 and RS-70.

Just a word on the fallibility of the Defense Department as opposed to the fallibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If we were going to rely on a system of logic, to say nothing of the Constitution, which may I say is inherent in a suggestion which was made by one of our distinguished colleagues, it seems to me there would be much involved, based on past history. For example, who is to resolve conflicts between the services over competing weapons systems? Are we to assume that because a uniformed officer makes a commitment to a system that such a judgment is infallible?

It has been indicated here by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], our chairman, and almost everybody that testified, and it hardly requires me at this juncture in the afternoon to point out, that we have undoubtedly the greatest Secretary of Defense in the history of this country. Moreover, may I say as a member of this committee and one who has been very close to the subject and who has tried to do his homework, that I can say the same thing about Dr. Brown. I think what we are doing in this day of exponential acceleration of weapons technology, where we must rely on science more and more in making decisions, this country needs excellence in every form. Mr. McNamara and Dr. Brown are men of excellence in their respective fields and this country can be proud and grateful they are in the public service.

When we get on this floor and make statements inadvertently or otherwise that cast reflections on such men I take strong exception to it.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution provides and our long tradition firmly establishes the doctrine of civilian control. I do not think that a careful study of the facts will support the suggestion that the Joint Chiefs should make the sole decision on any weapons system. History has shown on repeated occasions, ranging from iron men and wooden ships to steam power and armored vessels, 75mm cannon against howitzer siege guns, the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*; in fact through the whole history of military weaponry, the battle to change over

from one system to another has been met with violent repercussions and resistance.

No, Mr. Chairman, the matter of weapons systems is too important to be left to the admirals and generals. This is a matter for the Congress and the executive. I do not think that either the executive or the legislative branch has in any way been penurious in its allocation of our national resources for our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a superfluous and unneeded addition of \$363 million to the bill before us and I urge that you strike it from the bill by voting against the amendment.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] referred to those of us who voted against the committee amendment on the RS-70 as the Fearful Five. I plead guilty. It was not easy for me as a new member of the committee to vote against my chairman, the respected gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for whose limitless experience, well-deserved and excellent reputation, and demonstrated fairness in both today's debate and throughout the hearings, I have the highest regard.

But after attending 26 of the 27 posture hearings and listening to all of the testimony very carefully, I was constrained to conclude that a case had not been made for expanding the RS-70 program.

I have opposed in committee the recommended \$363 million funds increase in fiscal year 1964 appropriations for additional developments related to the experimental B-70 aircraft. The committee proposal is that these funds should be utilized, together with additional funds to be appropriated in each of the next 4 to 5 years, to buy two additional B-70 aircraft equipped in a reconnaissance-strike configuration. It must be remembered that the total additional bill in years to come would amount to over \$1 billion, according to present estimates, but the Secretary of the Air Force was frank and stated that costs generally run beyond estimates in an R. & D. program.

I do not believe that this increased expenditure can be justified at this time. We have heard that the basic development of the airframe is lagging, and that initial flights have been delayed. We have heard that funds are being spent for development of sensor equipment appropriate to the reconnaissance-strike mission. We have heard that alternate means of achieving the RS-70 mission are available, that these means have been evaluated as being much less expensive, and that they are in fact being implemented.

I would recommend to the House that the add-on for this purpose not be approved, but rather that the committee continue to keep informed of our progress in the development of the B-70 airframe, in sensor developments, and in the implementation of related systems so that, if necessary, appropriate action can be taken when all the returns are in.

I fully support the thesis that it is dangerous to assume that there is only a single way of starting or fighting a war, and that it is desirable that our deterrent force be flexible and have a clear strategic superiority over any possible opponents. I do not believe that a case has been made that the RS-70 would add significantly to our capabilities to satisfy these objectives. The administration's program is to implement a strong, secure missile force to complement our already very strong aircraft force.

The B-70 was initiated in study form approximately 10 years ago, long before either the Polaris or Minuteman programs were conceived. The RS-70 modification of the B-70 would not be fully operational until approximately 10 years in the future, long after Polaris and Minuteman are fully implemented.

I believe that a new manned strategic weapon system may be required to supplement the present manned aircraft and strategic missile forces. However, its design should complement the other strategic systems and recognize the changed environment that has resulted from the possession by both sides of protected and secure missile forces.

For these reasons I recommend that the RS-70 add-on not be approved.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEDZI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to call to the attention of the House that the RS-70 was very, very thoroughly discussed and when the vote was taken, it was 32 for and 5 against and the vote to report the bill out of the committee was unanimous and 36 members voted to report the bill out. I want to make that statement at this time so that my colleagues will have that in mind when they hear these arguments that are being made at this time.

Mr. NEDZI. I must remind my colleague that I stated that in my preliminary remarks. The gentleman has correctly stated the situation. I voted against the amendment. However, I voted for the authorization and I will vote for the entire bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Are you going to vote for this amendment?

Mr. NEDZI. I will not vote for the amendment; no, sir.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I heard here this afternoon one of the great speeches that I have heard since I have been in this Congress, and I only wish I could climb the forensic heights that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] climbed this afternoon. He made a magnificent speech. I do not agree with his conclusions but I certainly admire his ability.

He started out by saying that he took his position only after a great deal of soul searching. I want to observe that everybody knows that the five members of the Armed Service Committee who took a position in opposition to their chairman and to the senior members of the committee, did a lot of soul searching, too. I submit, however, that the soul searching which we did was

measured against the background of the performance of the system and not against the personality of the Secretary.

We heard yesterday that the Secretary of Defense is an ambitious man, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he would enlighten us as to what the end of these ambitions is, because, after all, the Secretary of Defense is a Republican, and if he has ambitions along certain lines I would like to know about it, because I might want to join in some of the critical remarks that are being made.

We heard from the gentleman from Louisiana that the record is replete with examples of men in civilian clothes overruling the military. We sit in civilian clothes here in this room, and we sat in civilian clothes in the committee. The military came in their uniforms. We sat and waited for the military to say that if they were going to have another \$363 million extra to spend they would spend it on these two RS-70 aircraft this year, and we are still waiting for them to say that. The Joint Chiefs of Staff never said that.

No admiral said that if there was going to be an extra \$363 million appropriated this is where they would spend it. The admirals said they would spend it on two attack submarines, and we listened to the admirals and that is where we put it—unanimously. The Army generals did not say that this is where they would spend the \$363 million if they were going to get an extra \$363 million to spend.

I call your attention to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina who talked about the fact that we are only building one combat aircraft. Actually we are building two combat aircraft today; we are building the F-105 and the F-110.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The gentleman does not want to tell us that the F-105 is a successful aircraft, does he?

Mr. PIKE. I certainly do.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I want to tell you—

Mr. PIKE. You are not going to tell me anything on my time. If you want to ask a question I will be delighted to answer it.

I certainly do mean to say that the F-105 is a successful aircraft.

But I say to you, I say if you are interested in manned planes, manned aircraft, these are fighter bombers. You could build 100 F-110's with the money which you are talking about for these two RS-70's. You could build 200 F-105's.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. No, I am not going to yield. I am certain the gentleman wants to say something pleasant, but I still am not going to yield.

You could build both the F-105 and the F-110's, which are complete weapons systems; and do not let anybody tell you that even with the extra money you

want to spend today it is going to make a complete weapons system out of the RS-70.

The chairman himself in his release when we passed this amendment said:

This would constitute a major step toward aircraft with most of the characteristics and capabilities of a true combat aircraft.

We waited for the Air Force to come in and say that this is where they would spend \$363 million. The Air Force itself never said this is where they would spend an extra \$363 million. So we civilians have dictated to the Air Force. We have told them they must spend this amount for this purpose.

Under these circumstances, I think we would, to quote the magnificent language of the gentleman from Louisiana, "be abdicating our responsibilities to support this amendment."

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to state why I intend to vote against the committee amendment which adds \$363 million to the bill's total authorization in order to provide for the construction of two additional B-70 bombers of the RS-70 configuration. The majority of members of the Armed Services Committee have added \$363 million to the requested authorization of the Secretary of Defense. Actually the committee additions are greater when you add the \$134 million for two additional "killer" submarines. But the fight has centered upon the RS-70 and here I am persuaded by the arguments made by five members of the Armed Services Committee against the additional amount. I have listened to the entire debate these 2 days, Mr. Chairman, read the committee reports and most of hearings.

I am not opposed to the concept of manned bombers. There is a specific need for manned bombers of the tactical type. B-52's and B-58's are presently being constructed. These aircraft now in production and other tactical aircraft planned for production will have massive striking capabilities not even contemplated 10 years ago when the B-70 was first considered. The B-70 was ordered for development in 1955. And yet today, 8 years later, no B-70 type aircraft has yet flown. Since then there has come into being the Titan, the Atlas, the Minuteman, and the Polaris missiles. At this moment these intercontinental ballistic missiles are operational and are rapidly taking over the major burden of our primary nuclear deterrent force.

It must be remembered that the RS-70 is to be used chiefly as an air launching site for nuclear warheaded missiles. But no one on the floor of this Chamber today or yesterday has argued that the B-70 will have greater, or even equal, accuracy, range, or invulnerability for this kind of strike capability over missiles. Manned strategic bombers are more vulnerable both on the ground and

in the air than are missiles. They take longer to launch. They take longer to reach their targets. In proportion to the number launched, they are much less likely to get through to their targets than are missiles.

In the last analysis, Mr. Chairman, this question comes down to economics, for no one argues that the security of the country is in the slightest endangered without the \$363 million over and above what the Secretary of Defense requested. This bill, including the \$363 million, calls for an authorization of \$15,358,691,000. The overall Department of Defense money request, without the \$363 million, is \$54 billion. This is the largest military budget in our history, and it represents over 55 percent of the total Federal budget. In the coming fiscal year we face a planned deficit of \$12 billion. No one can safely predict when within the next 10 years the budget will be in balance. Where, then, shall we begin to make cuts? Here is the first big money bill before us in this Congress.

Here is a perfect example of where priorities for expenditures must be stated. As stated in the minority views on this issue: "In these circumstances, any proposal to increase defense expenditures must be subjected to a very rigid cost-effectiveness test. These Members point out further, and it has not been rebutted, that the \$363 million is just the ante money. According to the Secretary of the Air Force, there will be needed beyond this initial funding from \$1.2 to \$1.5 billion.

As was pointed out in debate, if the Secretary of Defense had found it necessary to ask for this excess additional amount for the defense of the country he would not, in all likelihood, have put it in this area. It has been made clear, further, that not even the Air Force has said it would spend the \$363 million on the B-70 if it had the money to spend. Actually, Mr. Chairman, there is no end to what could be spent in any number of weapons systems. Given a free hand, the separate service chiefs undoubtedly would double their total figures. This is one reason why, fortunately, we have civilian control over the military.

I would like to point out also, Mr. Chairman, that next week the Armed Forces Committee will bring to the floor of the House an armed services pay bill which is approximately \$250 million over the amount requested by the Secretary of Defense. So here we go again. Add this to the \$363 million over requested amounts in the present bill and you are well over one-half billion dollars in excess amounts over requests in this year's authorization alone. And let us remember, as I said a moment ago, that this is just the ante money. It commits us in the billions in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, under all these circumstances, and with the assurance that we do not in the slightest degree endanger the security of our country or our defense commitments abroad, if we cannot or will not cut Federal expenditures here and now, how in all honesty can we expect to make cuts elsewhere in the budget in amounts sufficient to bring the budget in even near balance?

The committee amendment, Mr. Chairman, should be defeated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services, so I would like to take this time to ask the chairman a few questions.

We have been listening to the experts on the committee explain this bill for 2 days. I have heard some fine speeches. But would the chairman clear up a few points for me?

Am I to understand the Air Force has spent in excess of a billion dollars to produce an RS-70 bomber that does not have a weapons system, and as your report states:

By no stretch of the imagination would the Secretary's program develop a fighting machine.

Is that what we are supposed to understand today?

Mr. VINSON. The report is absolutely correct in this respect. That is the very reason we are asking to continue this program. We will have spent almost \$1,300 million, and we propose to spend \$81 million more for the current low level program. But even after that expenditure is made, we will have only three prototype planes. We will to a great extent have wasted our money.

Mr. PUCINSKI. With no weapons system?

Mr. VINSON. With no weapons system in the first three planes. We will have spent \$1,300 million, and what do we get in return? Very little.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In your report it is stated:

It has also taken the position that with the development of the fourth and fifth prototypes, the supporting systems that would make it a weapons system would be simultaneously developed.

In the language of the amendment you have here \$686 million is being authorized with \$363,700,000 earmarked for research and development and tests of the RS-70 program.

Under the language of this amendment, what assurance do we have, even with this additional money, plus the approximately \$1 billion more that will be needed later that you will develop a weapons system in these five aircraft? Under the language in your amendment, what assurance do we have that even with the additional money we still won't have five aircraft without a weapons system.

Mr. VINSON. No absolute assurance, of course. There is no absolute certainty in a field like this—How can there be? But we're most optimistic.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But in the amendment, you do not earmark it specifically for research and development and test-

ing of a weapons system, which the gentleman tells us the airplane does not have. You merely authorize for additional research and development and testing of the RS-70 program, in the language of this amendment. I would like to know what assurance we have when you are through with the expenditure of this money that we will actually have a weapons system in these RS-70 bombers?

Mr. VINSON. We have every reason to think we will be able to do it. And all of the scientists and all of the experts say it will be an outstanding weapons system.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is nothing in this amendment as it is now before the House that will provide \$363 million additional for development specifically of a weapons system, which is the very thing that the committee tells us it wants the money for.

Mr. VINSON. But the RS-70 is by its very name aimed at a weapons system. What else would be done but make a weapons system out of it?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is that not what we voted on when we voted the original appropriation for this program?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, we voted for a program that would lead us to a weapons system. But they did not push the program the way they should have over in the Pentagon.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to do anything that would be in any way harmful to our defense system, but it seems to me, with this additional money here today, there is still no assurance that we are going to have a weapons system in these RS-70 bombers.

Mr. VINSON. Well, it is as sure as anything that science can develop. If we spend this money and bring in these two additional planes, they will be so equipped that they will constitute a weapons system. That is the objective of the whole thing.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Vinson) there were—ayes 118, noes 99.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina and Mr. STRATTON.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 109.

So the amendment was agreed to. Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the time of the House at this hour; I am somewhat timid to comment on this bill because I am in no sense a military expert. I am not even a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that under the request that I submitted to the Committee all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto had closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The request made by the gentleman from Georgia applied to the committee amendment, not to the bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the House for taking its time at this hour of the day, but I am concerned about an item in the bill which has to do with block obsolescence of naval ship construction. While I am not a military expert, I am interested in block obsolescence of ships. This stems from my service on the House Committee on Merchant Marine where we have had to deal with block obsolescence in our merchant fleet over a period of several years. I think history has demonstrated to the military the absolute and utter importance of seapower. The gentleman from New York awhile ago mentioned D-day. I want to say to you that D-day was delayed for a long period of time simply because the United States did not have seapower. As a matter of fact, the whole course of the war was delayed because we did not have seapower. I have never heard any military spokesman deny those statements. As a matter of fact, I am simply repeating what they said before our committee over the years.

Now, a strange thing has happened. The Russians have taken a leaf out of our book of experience and are expanding their seapower because they recognize the utter importance of it. They are in the midst of a naval and commercial ship construction program. I predict that at the end of 10 years, unless we do something about block obsolescence in the Navy the Russians will be the No. 1 seapower in the world.

I am not one to suggest that just because the Russians do something that we do that also. But I do want to point to the fact that they recognize the importance of seapower and we are neglecting it by not taking care of the problem we have now.

My interest stems from the national defense aspects, but it also stems from the dollar cost of a replacement program in the final analysis. The experience we have had in connection with the replacement of our obsolescent merchant vessels in World War II is that it cost us better than \$10 billion in excess of what it should have.

In other words, our crash shipbuilding program cost us better than \$14 billion. All the shipbuilding experts have told us that if we had had a regular program of ship construction and replacement it would have cost us only \$4 billion. I say we will have the same experience if we let our naval ship obsolescence problem continue without doing anything about it. A crash shipbuilding program, toward which we are heading, will cost us many billions of more dollars than it would if we started to do something about the problem now.

Furthermore, any crash program of ship construction will not only cost additional money but many of the ships

constructed under such a program will not be up to date when they are completed. This happened in World War I, when we had a crash shipbuilding program. When the war was over many hundreds of ships we built under the crash program ended up in the bays and the rivers, and there they rotted until they sank. They were never used. They were not up to date, and did not meet the needs of the time. They were prototype ships which did not meet the new requirements which arose with the passage of time.

I want to commend the committee for considering this problem, and I particularly want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], who recognize the problem and have sought to do something about it. I am only sorry that the Defense Department does not. I am hopeful that the committee in its consideration of an authorization bill next year will recommend the construction of an adequate number of naval vessels to meet the obsolescence problem.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to commend the gentleman for what he has said, and point out that what took place in World War II had previously taken place in World War I. It is about time that we learned these lessons from our many wars.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHELLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 288, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the remaining amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report on the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, strike out "\$322,986,000" and insert "\$686,686,000 of which amount \$363,700,000 is authorized only for research, development, and test of the RS-70."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 179, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—226

Abbutt	Fuqua	Philbin
Abele	Gallagher	Plicher
Abernethy	Gathings	Pirnie
Adair	Gavin	Poage
Albert	Glenn	Poff
Alger	Gonzalez	Pool
Andrews	Goodling	Price
Arends	Grant	Purcell
Ashmore	Gray	Quillen
Aspinall	Green, Pa.	Reid, Ill.
Auchincloss	Gubser	Reid, N.Y.
Avery	Hagan, Ga.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Baker	Hagen, Calif.	Rich
Baldwin	Haley	Rivers, S.C.
Baring	Hall	Roberts, Tex.
Barrett	Hardy	Robison
Barry	Harris	Rodino
Bates	Harrison	Rogers, Colo.
Battin	Harsha	Rogers, Fla.
Beckworth	Hebert	Rogers, Tex.
Beermann	Hemphill	Roudebush
Belcher	Henderson	St. George
Bell	Herlong	St. Germain
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman	Saylor
Betts	Hollifield	Schadeberg
Blatnik	Horton	Schenck
Boggs	Hosmer	Schweiker
Bolton,	Huddleston	Schwengel
Oliver P.	Hull	Scott
Bonner	Johansen	Secrest
Bray	Jones, Ala.	Selden
Bromwell	Karsten	Shelley
Brozman	Karth	Sheppard
Brown, Ohio	Keith	Shriver
Bruce	Kilburn	Sibal
Burke	Kilgore	Sikes
Burkhalter	King, Calif.	Sisk
Byrne, Pa.	King, N.Y.	Smith, Calif.
Carey	Kirwan	Snyder
Celler	Kluczynski	Springer
Chamberlain	Kunkel	Stafford
Chenoweth	Landrum	Steed
Clancy	Lankford	Stephens
Clark	Latta	Stinson
Cooley	Lennon	Stubblefield
Cunningham	Lesinski	Taft
Curtin	Libonati	Talcott
Dague	Lipscomb	Taylor
Daniels	Long, La.	Thompson, La.
Davis, Ga.	Long, Md.	Thompson, Tex.
Dawson	McDade	Thornberry
Delaney	McIntire	Toll
Dent	McMillan	Trimble
Denton	Mahon	Tuck
Devine	Marsh	Tuten
Dole	Martin, Calif.	Utt
Donohue	Martin, Mass.	Van Pelt
Dorn	Martin, Nebr.	Vinson
Dowdy	Mathias	Waggoner
Downing	Miller, Calif.	Wallhauser
Doyle	Milliken	Watson
Dwyer	Mills	Weaver
Edmondson	Minish	Weitner
Elliott	Moore	Whalley
Everett	Morgan	White
Evins	Morris	Whitener
Fascell	Morrison	Wickersham
Feighan	Morse	Widnall
Fisher	Morton	Williams
Flood	Moss	Willis
Fogarty	Norblad	Wilson, Boh
Ford	O'Neill	Winstead
Foreman	Osmer	Wright
Forrester	Passman	Young
Fountain	Patman	Zablocki
Frelinghuysen	Pepper	

NAYS—179

Addabbo	Burton	Edwards
Anderson	Byrnes, Wis.	Ellsworth
Ashbrook	Cahill	Fallon
Ashley	Cameron	Farbstein
Ayres	Cannon	Findley
Bass	Cederberg	Finnegan
Bennett, Mich.	Chelf	Fino
Berry	Cleveland	Flynt
Boland	Cohelan	Fraser
Bolling	Collier	Friedel
Bolton,	Colmer	Fulton, Pa.
Frances P.	Conte	Fulton, Tenn.
Bow	Corbett	Garmatz
Brademas	Corman	Gary
Brock	Cramer	Gialmo
Brooks	Curtis	Gibbons
Broomfield	Deroonian	Gilbert
Brown, Calif.	Derwinski	Gill
Broyhill, N.C.	Diggs	Goodell
Broyhill, Va.	Dingell	Grabowski
Buckley	Dulski	Green, Oreg.
Burleson	Duncan	Griffin

Gross	McFall	Rivers, Alaska
Grover	McLoskey	Roberts, Ala.
Halleck	Macdonald	Rooney
Halpern	MacGregor	Rosenthal
Hanna	Mailliard	Rostenkowski
Hansen	Matsunaga	Roush
Harding	May	Rumsfeld
Harvey, Ind.	Meador	Ryan, Mich.
Harvey, Mich.	Michel	Ryan, N.Y.
Hawkins	Minshall	St. Onge
Hays	Monagan	Schneebell
Hechler	Montoya	Senner
Hoeven	Moorhead	Shipley
Holland	Mosher	Short
Horan	Multer	Siler
Hutchinson	Murphy, Ill.	Skubitz
Ichord	Murphy, N.Y.	Slack
Jarman	Natcher	Smith, Iowa
Jennings	Nedzi	Staebler
Jensen	Nelsen	Stratton
Joelson	Nygard	Sullivan
Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.	O'Hara, Ill.	Thomas
Jonas	O'Hara, Mich.	Thompson, N.J.
Jones, Mo.	O'Konski	Thomson, Wis.
Kastenmeier	Olsen, Mont.	Tollefson
Kelly	Olsen, Minn.	Udall
Keogh	Ostertag	Ullman
Knox	Pelly	Van Deerlin
Kornegay	Perkins	Vanik
Kyl	Pike	Watts
Laird	Pillion	Westland
Langen	Powell	Wharton
Leggett	Pucinski	Whitten
Lindsay	Quile	Wilson, Ind.
Lloyd	Randall	Wydler
McCulloch	Reifel	Wyman
McDowell	Rhodes, Pa.	Younger

NOT VOTING—29

Becker	Madden	Roosevelt
Casey	Matthews	Roybal
Clausen	Miller, N.Y.	Sickles
Daddario	Murray	Smith, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Nix	Staggers
Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.	Teague, Tex.
Gurney	Patten	Tupper
Healey	Rains	Walter
Kee	Reuss	Wilson,
McClory	Riehlman	Charles H.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Healey against.
Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Roybal against.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Daddario against.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Sickles against.
Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Tupper for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Becker for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Madden with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Clausen.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McClory.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, earlier in today's debate I voted to strike the committee amendment which added \$363 million unasked for funds in the case of the RS-70. I stated my reasons in full for doing so. I regret that our efforts failed. I am supporting also the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], which instructs the Committee on Armed Services to make an across-the-board cut on procurements and a 12-percent across-

the-board cut on research and development. Excepted from these instructions are naval torpedoes. This motion, if carried, would cut about \$800 million from this \$15 billion bill.

Mr. Speaker, such a cut will not, in the least way, prejudice the armed might of America. The figures are based on solid research by minority members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Armed Services. This will squeeze the fat out of the Pentagon. In four separate reports, the General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, has pointed to specific instances of waste and duplication which add up to at least the figure we intend to save. Less than 50 percent of procurement is handled by competitive bidding on a group basis between the services. Various expert reports indicate that sums in the amount mentioned can be saved by changes in procedures alone, without cutting military hardware.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress to force some reforms and a little bit of austerity in the military complex of America.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CURTIS moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2440, to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report back forthwith the following amendments: On page 2, line 3, strike out "\$522,100,000" and insert "\$495,895,000".

On page 2, line 4, strike out "\$1,958,700,000" and insert "\$1,860,765,000".

On page 2, line 5, strike out "\$3,559,000,000" and insert "\$3,381,050,000".

On page 2, line 7, strike out "\$580,700,000" and insert "\$551,665,000".

On page 2, line 8, strike out "\$1,107,300,000" and insert "\$1,051,935,000, of which amount \$60,000,000 is authorized for the procurement of torpedoes".

On page 2, line 8, strike out "\$14,700,000" and insert "\$13,965,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike out "\$2,177,000,000" and insert "\$2,068,150,000".

On page 2, line 15, strike out "\$82,148,000" and insert "\$78,040,600".

On page 2, line 16, strike out "\$204,183,000" and insert "\$193,973,850".

On page 2, line 21, strike out "\$576,601,000" and insert "\$547,770,950".

On page 2, line 22, strike out "\$590,133,000" and insert "\$560,626,350".

On page 2, line 23, strike out "\$1,060,132,000" and insert "\$1,007,125,400".

On page 2, line 25, strike "\$293,008,000" and insert "\$278,357,600".

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS) there were—ayes 118, noes 201.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 258, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—149

Abele	Foreman	Morton
Adair	Frelinghuysen	Mosher
Alger	Fulton, Pa.	Nelsen
Anderson	Goodell	Nygaard
Ashbrook	Goodling	O'Konski
Avery	Griffin	Ostertag
Ayres	Gross	Pelly
Baker	Grover	Pillion
Barry	Haley	Poff
Beermann	Hall	Quile
Belcher	Halleck	Quillen
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison	Reid, Ill.
Berry	Harsha	Reid, N.Y.
Betts	Harvey, Ind.	Reifel
Bolton	Harvey, Mich.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hoeven	Robison
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hoffman	Roudebush
Bow	Horan	Rumsfeld
Brock	Horton	Ryan, N.Y.
Bromwell	Hutchinson	St. George
Broomfield	Jensen	Schadeberg
Brotzman	Johansen	Schenck
Brown, Calif.	Jonas	Schneebeli
Brown, Ohio	Kastenmeier	Schwengel
Broyhill, N.C.	Keith	Shipley
Broyhill, Va.	Kilburn	Short
Bruce	King, N.Y.	Shriver
Burton	Knox	Sibal
Byrnes, Wis.	Kunkel	Siler
Cannon	Kyl	Skubitz
Cederberg	Laird	Smith, Calif.
Chenoweth	Langen	Snyder
Cleveland	Latta	Stinson
Collier	Lindsay	Taft
Colmer	Lipscomb	Talcott
Conte	Lloyd	Teague, Calif.
Corbett	McCulloch	Thomson, Wis.
Cramer	McIntire	Tollefson
Cunningham	McLoskey	Utt
Curtin	MacGregor	Van Pelt
Curtis	Martin, Calif.	Weaver
Dague	Martin, Nebr.	Westland
Derounian	Mathias	Wharton
Derwinski	May	Widnall
Devine	Meador	Williams
Dole	Michel	Wilson, Ind.
Ellsworth	Milliken	Wyder
Feighan	Minshall	Wyman
Findley	Moore	Younger
Ford	Morse	

NAYS—258

Abbt	Daniels	Gilbert
Abernethy	Davis, Ga.	Gill
Addabbo	Dawson	Glenn
Albert	Delaney	Gonzalez
Andrews	Dent	Grabowski
Arends	Denton	Grant
Ashley	Diggs	Gray
Ashmore	Dingell	Green, Oreg.
Aspinall	Donohue	Green, Pa.
Auchincloss	Dorn	Gubser
Baldwin	Dowdy	Hagan, Ga.
Baring	Downing	Hagen, Calif.
Barrett	Doyle	Halpern
Bass	Dulski	Hanna
Bates	Duncan	Hansen
Battin	Dwyer	Harding
Beckworth	Edmondson	Hardy
Bell	Edwards	Harris
Bennett, Fla.	Elliott	Hawkins
Blatnik	Everett	Hays
Boggs	Evins	Hébert
Boland	Fallon	Hechler
Bolling	Farbstein	Hemphill
Bonner	Fascell	Henderson
Brademas	Finnegan	Herlong
Bray	Fino	Hollifield
Brooks	Fisher	Holland
Buckley	Flood	Hosmer
Burke	Flynt	Huddleston
Burkhalter	Fogarty	Hull
Burleson	Forrester	Ichord
Byrne, Pa.	Fountain	Jarman
Cahill	Fraser	Jennings
Cameron	Friedel	Joelson
Carey	Fulton, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.
Celler	Fuqua	Johnson, Wis.
Chamberlain	Gallagher	Jones, Ala.
Chelf	Garmatz	Karsten
Clancy	Gary	Karth
Clark	Gathings	Kelly
Cohelan	Gavin	Keogh
Cooley	Glaimo	Kilgore
Corman	Gibbons	King, Calif.

Kirwan	O'Neill	Sikes
Kluczynski	Osmer	Sisk
Kornegay	Passman	Slack
Landrum	Patman	Smith, Iowa
Lankford	Pepper	Springer
Leggett	Perkins	Staebl
Lennon	Philbin	Stafford
Lesinski	Pike	Steed
Libonati	Pilcher	Stephens
Long, La.	Pirnie	Stratton
Long, Md.	Poage	Stubblefield
McDade	Pool	Sullivan
McDowell	Powell	Taylor
McFall	Price	Thomas
McMillan	Pucinski	Thompson, La.
Macdonald	Purcell	Thompson, N.J.
Mahon	Randall	Thompson, Tex.
Maillard	Rhodes, Pa.	Thornberry
Marsh	Rich	Toll
Martin, Mass.	Rivers, Alaska	Trimble
Matsunaga	Rivers, S.C.	Tuck
Miller, Calif.	Roberts, Ala.	Tuten
Mills	Roberts, Tex.	Udall
Minish	Rodino	Ullman
Monagan	Rogers, Colo.	Van Deerin
Montoya	Rogers, Fla.	Vanik
Moorhead	Rogers, Tex.	Vinson
Morgan	Rooney	Waggoner
Morris	Rosenthal	Wallhauser
Morrison	Rostenkowski	Watson
Moss	Roush	Watts
Multer	Ryan, Mich.	Weitner
Murphy, Ill.	St. Germain	Whalley
Murphy, N.Y.	St. Onge	White
Murray	Saylor	Whitener
Natchar	Schweiker	Whitten
Nedzi	Scott	Wickersham
Norblad	Secrest	Willis
O'Brien, N.Y.	Selden	Wilson, Bob
O'Hara, Ill.	Senner	Winstead
O'Hara, Mich.	Shelley	Wright
Olsen, Mont.	Sheppard	Young
Olson, Minn.	Sickles	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—27

Becker	Madden	Roybal
Casey	Matthews	Smith, Va.
Clausen	Miller, N.Y.	Staggers
Daddario	Nix	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	O'Brien, Ill.	Tupper
Griffiths	Patten	Walter
Gurney	Rains	Wilson,
Healey	Reuss	Charles H.
Kee	Riehlman	
McClory	Roosevelt	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Gurney for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Tupper against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Casey with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Clausen.

Mr. Nix with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Roybal.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Staggers.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Patten.

Mr. COLLIER and Mr. TOLLEFSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; there were—yeas 374, nays 33, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—374

Abbt	Andrews	Auchincloss
Abele	Arends	Avery
Abernethy	Ashbrook	Ayres
Adair	Ashley	Baker
Addabbo	Ashmore	Baldwin
Albert	Aspinall	Baring

Barrett	Garmatz	Monagan
Barry	Gary	Montoya
Bass	Gathings	Moore
Bates	Gavin	Moorhead
Battin	Glaimo	Morgan
Beckworth	Gibbons	Morris
Beermann	Gilbert	Morrison
Belcher	Gill	Morse
Bell	Glenn	Morton
Bennett, Fla.	Gonzalez	Moss
Bennett, Mich.	Goodling	Multer
Berry	Grabowski	Murphy, Ill.
Betts	Grant	Murphy, N.Y.
Blatnik	Gray	Murray
Boggs	Green, Oreg.	Natcher
Boland	Green, Pa.	Nedzi
Bolling	Griffin	Norblad
Bolton	Grover	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bolton, Frances P.	Gubser	O'Hara, Ill.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hagan, Ga.	O'Hara, Mich.
Bonner	Hagen, Calif.	Olsen, Mont.
Brademas	Haley	Olson, Minn.
Bray	Hall	O'Neill
Bromwell	Halpern	Osmer
Brooks	Hanna	Ostertag
Broomfield	Hansen	Passman
Brotzman	Harding	Patman
Brown, Calif.	Hardy	Pelly
Brown, Ohio	Harris	Pepper
Broyhill, N.C.	Harrison	Perkins
Broyhill, Va.	Harsha	Philbin
Bruce	Harvey, Ind.	Pike
Burton	Harvey, Mich.	Pilcher
Byrnes, Wis.	Hawkins	Pillion
Cannon	Hays	Pirnie
Cederberg	Hébert	Poage
Chenoweth	Hechler	Poff
Cleveland	Hemphill	Pool
Collier	Henderson	Powell
Colmer	Herlong	Price
Conte	Hoeven	Pucinski
Corn	Hoffman	Purcell
Cramer	Hollifield	Quillen
Cunningham	Holland	Randall
Curtin	Horton	Reid, Ill.
Dague	Hosmer	Reid, N.Y.
Daniels	Huddleston	Reifel
Davis, Ga.	Hull	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dawson	Hutchinson	Rhodes, Pa.
Delaney	Ichord	Rich
Dent	Jarman	Rivers, Alaska
Denton	Jennings	Rivers, S.C.
Derwinski	Joelson	Roberts, Ala.
Devine	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts, Tex.
Diggs	Johnson, Wis.	Robison
Dingell	Jonas	Rodino
Dole	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Donohue	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Dorn	Karsten	Rogers, Tex.
Dowdy	Karth	Rooney
Downing	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Doyle	Keith	Rostenkowski
Dulski	Kelly	Roudebush
Duncan	Keogh	Roush
Dwyer	Kilburn	Ryan, Mich.
Edmondson	Kilgore	Ryan, N.Y.
Edwards	King, Calif.	St. Germain
Elliott	King, N.Y.	St. Onge
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Schenck
Everett	Kluczynski	Schweiker
Evins	Kornegay	Schwengel
Fallon	Kunkel	Scott
Farbstein	Kyl	Secrest
Fascell	Landrum	Selden
Finnegan	Lankford	Senner
Fino	Latta	Shelley
Fisher	Leggett	Sheppard
Flood	Lennon	Shipley
Flynt	Lesinski	Shriver
Fogarty	Libonati	Sibal
Forrester	Lindsay	Sickles
Fountain	Lloyd	Sikes
Fraser	Long, La.	Siler
Friedel	Long, Md.	Sisk
Fuqua	McCulloch	Skubitz
Gallagher	McDade	Slack
Garmatz	McDowell	Smith, Calif.
Gary	McFall	Smith, Iowa
Gathings	McIntire	Snyder
Gavin	McLoskey	Springer
Glaimo	McMillan	Staebl
Gibbons	Macdonald	Stafford
	Mahon	Steed
	Maillard	Stephens
	Marsh	Stinson
	Martin, Calif.	Stratton
	Martin, Nebr.	Stubblefield
	Martin, Mass.	Sullivan
	Mathias	Taft
	Matsunaga	Talcott
	Frelinghuysen	Teague, Calif.
	Friedel	Thomas
	Friedel	Thompson, La.
	Fulton, Pa.	Thompson, N.J.
	Fulton, Tenn.	Thompson, Tex.
	Fuqua	
	Gallagher	

Thomson, Wis.	Vinson	Widnall
Thornberry	Waggoner	Williams
Toll	Wallhauser	Willis
Tollefson	Watson	Wilson, Bob
Trimble	Watts	Winstead
Tuck	Weaver	Wright
Tuten	Weltner	Wydler
Udall	Whalley	Wyman
Ullman	Wharton	Young
Utt	White	Younger
Van Deerlin	Whitener	Zablocki
Vanik	Whitten	
Van Pelt	Wickersham	

NAYS—33

Alger	Halleck	Nelsen
Anderson	Horan	Nygaard
Bow	Jensen	O'Konski
Brock	Johansen	Quile
Brown, Calif.	Laird	Rumsfeld
Byrnes, Wis.	Langen	St. George
Curtis	Lipcomb	Schadeberg
Darroulan	MacGregor	Schneebeli
Ford	Michel	Short
Goodell	Minshall	Westland
Gross	Mosher	Wilson, Ind.

NOT VOTING—28

Becker	Roosevelt	Roybal
Casey	Madden	Smith, Va.
Clausen	Matthews	Staggers
Daddario	Miller, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Nix	Tupper
Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.	Walter
Gurney	Patten	Wilson
Healey	Rains	Charles H.
Kee	Reuss	
McClory	Riehlman	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Becker.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Clausen.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Nix with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Patten.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Staggers.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my disappointment in the House action taken on H.R. 2440, a \$15.8 billion Armed Forces authorization bill for procurement, research, development, and other purposes.

This is an important bill, both in amount and nature. The total Federal budget request for fiscal year 1964 is \$98.9 billion, and the total request for new obligational authority for the Department of Defense is \$52.1 billion. This \$15.8 billion authorization bill involves over 15 percent of the 1964 fiscal year budget requests for all planned expenditures for the Nation and over 30 percent of all defense budget requests for fiscal 1964.

No one, and certainly not this Member, would permit this Nation to cut corners on our national security. However, because we in the House of Representatives failed to meet our responsibilities, it was necessary for me, in good conscience and in the exercise of my independent judgment, to vote against this bill in the hope it would be returned to committee, trimmed of waste, and returned to the floor for passage. It is now my hope that the Appropriations Committee will give careful study and thought to ways in which the amounts might be reduced without endangering our defense posture.

While I have high respect for the Secretary of Defense and for the members

of the Armed Services Committee, it is difficult to understand how, in a \$15.8 billion bill, the Congress could accept each item as presented by the administration without a single cut and then add an additional \$497 million.

I appreciate that the funds added were for the potentially valuable RS-70, which I believe in and opposed only because the administration has repeatedly said it would not use the funds even if authorized by Congress, and the vitally necessary two additional killer subs, which I supported. However, I am convinced that there is sufficient fat in the bill to accommodate these additions if necessary and still make substantial savings.

To be specific, the most obvious way to save on defense spending is to cut waste and improve procurement procedures. This was a poor bill because it failed to cut the waste in defense procurement; it failed to force an improvement in procedures which led to the corruption and waste in the recent Signal Corps scandal, to cite but one example; it failed to include recommendations to encourage competitive bids with a corresponding reduction in sole-source, negotiated, and cost-plus contracts.

We talk of economy. Yet by a vote of 374 to 33 the House rubber-stamped 15 percent of the Federal budget, and possibly the largest administration bill which will be before the Congress this year, without a single cut. Undoubtedly it was because defense spending is considered sacrosanct. National defense is sacrosanct, but waste in defense spending is not; and waste and inefficiency are always present in a \$50-billion-plus operation. Instances of waste in defense spending are continuously being revealed by the General Accounting Office. A few examples are illustrated by the recent Sun-Times editorial of March 12, 1963, which I request permission to insert in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the fiscal situation in this country and the planned budget deficit of \$11.9 billion. I believe our economy needs a tax cut to bring the now confiscatory tax structure in line with the needs of 1963. Furthermore, I would desire a tax cut without the administration's misnamed reforms which would do much to discourage the homeowner, to harm educational institutions, hospitals, and other charitable institutions.

However, unless the Congress carefully but firmly cuts at least the more obvious waste out of the proposed Federal budget, whether in agriculture, defense, NASA, and even the congressional budget, and with our gold-plated third office building and certain abuses by some individuals of counterpart funds we are not free from criticism, we will not have a tax cut.

The House must not fail to meet its responsibilities. Waste is a luxury we cannot afford. We must give up some of our sacred cows. The question before the 88th Congress is, "Will we meet this responsibility or will we talk one way and vote another?"

The editorial follows:

THE MIND REELS

The way of a Government agency with a dollar is a wondrous thing to behold—if you happen not to be a taxpayer.

The watchdog of the taxpayer's pocket, the General Accounting Office under Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, is the authority for the following brief notations of waste and general inefficiency in the stewardship of the taxpayer's money by the military.

Item: The project to build a nuclear-powered aircraft languished for 15 years at a total cost of \$1 billion. No aircraft had been built when the program terminated.

The GAO did find that \$17,147,000 had been spent to construct facilities that were used but little. Another \$2,953,000 was spent for design and related work and never used. There were grave deficiencies in administration and a distinct lag in the making of vital decisions during the life of the program.

Item: In order to satisfy the Department of the Air Force the Defense Petroleum Supply Center negotiated eight contracts for petroleum storage in new dispersed and protected commercially-owned facilities.

Cost to the taxpayer: \$10,300,000 more than if similar Government facilities had been used. There was no evidence that the Air Force had made any cost comparisons before granting the contracts.

Item: The Government incurred unnecessary costs of \$5 million to rebuild unused deteriorated tracks for tanks and other vehicles because the Army had allowed these tracks to deteriorate in storage.

Item: The Corps of Engineers (Army) had spent \$575,000 to purchase 925 25-horsepower outboard motors and had plans to buy another 553 25-horsepower outboard motors for \$321,000. The Army had in depot stock at least 1,400 such motors that had never been used. The new purchases were intended to replace these unused motors.

President Kennedy has challenged those who criticize his budget to show where cuts can be made. It seems odd that he must ask. The GAO sends the President a copy of every one of its reports.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment on my vote on H.R. 2440—the bill authorizing \$15,856,390,000 for defense procurement and research projects.

I voted for continuation of the RS-70 manned-bomber program since I feel most strongly that this is vital to our strategic defense.

I very definitely believe that we must remain militarily strong; and although I have advocated—and shall continue to advocate—economy in government, I do not feel that we should economize to the point where we weaken our defenses in any way. In regard to H.R. 2440, however, I believe that it might be possible to cut the amount requested—which was in excess of the amount asked for by the administration—and still maintain our military strength at a level second to none. I, therefore, voted for recommitment of the bill for further study by the Committee on Armed Forces.

When this recommitment motion failed—and because of my respect for the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services—I accepted that committee's recommendation and voted for passage of H.R. 2440.

However, I want it understood that when I have the opportunity to vote on specific appropriations in the future, I intend to vote to cut expenditures where

I feel that such cuts are sound and will not result in impairment to our national security and well-being.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter including certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues will remember that on March 4, I was granted unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a detailed table con-

cerning the projects of the United Nations Special Fund. That table listed Fund projects from the Fund's inception in May 1959 until May 1962.

In my continuing investigation of the Special Fund I have obtained details about the 42 new projects of the Fund for which approval was voted at a Governing Council meeting this January. I, therefore, now wish to insert in the RECORD a table listing these details. By combining the information in the March 4 table and the information in this table, Members of the House may determine easily the status of any and every project ever carried out by the Special Fund.

May I note that the 42 projects involve a total cost of \$96,632,300 and a Special Fund contribution of \$43,673,500. American taxpayers will want to notice that their 40 percent of that Fund contribution comes to \$17,069,400.

Over the 4 years of its existence the Special Fund now has spent a total of \$250,625,800 for some 286 projects around the world. It is interesting to see that the Food and Agriculture Organization, which plans to spend \$1.2 million in Castro Cuba under a Fund grant of 1961, has administered by far the most projects of any U.N. agency.

The FAO has participated in 113 projects.

I might point out again that the International Atomic Energy Agency has participated in only one project—that in Yugoslavia.

I am pleased to be able to inform the House that none of the 42 projects approved this year are in Communist-bloc nations. This will be of some relief to American taxpayers who are footing 40 percent of the Special Fund bill. However, let us not forget that under continuing projects started in earlier years the Special Fund still is involved in six projects in Communist Cuba, Communist Yugoslavia, and Communist Poland at a cost to the American taxpayer of \$2,249,040.

The nations and territories represented in the 42 new Special Fund projects are: Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Iran, Jordan, Madagascar, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, South Korea, Senegal, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, UAR, Singapore, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

3. Costs of individual projects, January 1963

Project by country	Approved by governing council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Cost of projects (U.S. dollar equivalent)		
				Total	Special fund earmarkings ¹	Government counterpart contribution ²
Afghanistan: Groundwater investigation.....	January 1963.....	U.N.....	5	2,099,700	1,389,700	710,000
Argentina: Mineral survey in the Andean Cordillera.....	do.....	U.N.....	4	2,410,900	1,160,900	1,244,000
Bolivia: Technological Research Institute, La Paz.....	do.....	U.N.....	5	1,354,600	695,600	659,000
Brazil: Power development program for south central Brazil.....	do.....	IBRD.....	3	3,627,300	1,823,300	1,804,000
Ceylon: Improvement of oil handling facilities in the port of Colombo.....	do.....	IBRD.....	1 1/2	133,000	111,000	22,000
Chile: Mineral resources survey of the Province of Coquimbo.....	do.....	U.N.....	1 1/2	805,100	507,100	298,000
China:						
Metal Industries Development Center, Kaohsiung.....	do.....	ILO.....	5	2,040,000	1,142,000	898,000
Comprehensive hydraulic development survey of the Choshui and Wu Basins.....	do.....	U.N.....	3	1,594,800	885,800	709,000
Colombia: School of Engineering, National University, Bogotá.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	5	1,743,100	604,100	1,139,000
Ecuador: Preinvestment studies on forestry development in the northwest.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	1,720,600	825,600	895,000
Gabon: Iron ore transport survey.....	do.....	IBRD.....	2	2,892,000	2,092,000	800,000
Ghana:						
Food research and development unit.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	1,880,800	880,800	1,000,000
Preparation of a master plan for water supply and sewerage.....	do.....	WHO.....	2	2,153,300	865,300	1,288,000
Greece: Training of technical teachers for vocational industrial schools.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	4	3,211,500	932,500	2,279,000
Guatemala: Preinvestment study on forestry development.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	1,660,200	767,200	893,000
Guinea: Improvement and expansion of rice cultivation in the coastal lowlands.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	1,818,100	1,147,100	671,000
India: Institute of Tropical Meteorology and International Meteorological Center.....	do.....	WMO.....	3	2,003,500	873,500	1,130,000
Iran:						
Animal Husbandry Research Institute, Hyderabad.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	4,308,100	919,100	3,389,000
Pasture and fodder crop investigations unit, Karaj.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	2,670,800	626,800	1,944,000
Jordan: Training and demonstration in afforestation and forest management.....	do.....	FAO.....	4	797,400	507,400	290,000
Lebanon: Soil survey and related irrigation schemes.....	do.....	FAO.....	4	1,029,700	485,700	544,000
Madagascar: Educational Training and Research Institute, Tananarive.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	6	2,924,200	1,435,200	1,489,000
Mexico: National Agricultural Institute, Chapingo.....	do.....	FAO.....	4	4,846,300	1,714,300	3,132,000
Morocco: Integrated economic plan for agricultural development of the Sebou region.....	do.....	FAO.....	3	4,449,000	1,240,000	3,209,000
Nicaragua: Mineral survey.....	do.....	U.N.....	2 1/2	1,093,500	738,500	355,000
Nigeria:						
Secondary School Teacher Training College, western region.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	5	3,583,700	1,170,700	2,413,000
Federal Civil Aviation Training Center, Kaduna.....	do.....	ICAO.....	5	3,698,000	1,691,000	2,007,000
Panama: Water resources survey of the Chiriqui and Chico River Basins.....	do.....	U.N.....	2	509,600	418,600	91,000
Peru: School of Technology, National Engineering University, Lima.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	5	2,469,800	1,194,800	1,275,000
Republic of Korea: Soil fertility survey and soil research.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	2,486,000	896,000	1,590,000
Senegal: Mineral survey.....	do.....	U.N.....	3	1,520,600	924,600	596,000
Syria: Training of civil engineers at the University of Damascus.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	5	3,777,100	832,100	2,945,000
Thailand: Paper and pulp material survey.....	do.....	FAO.....	3	769,300	557,300	212,000
Tunisia: Preparation of an integrated rural plan for central Tunisia.....	do.....	FAO.....	3	2,066,600	994,600	1,072,000
Turkey: Crop Research and Introduction Center, Izmir.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	2,054,200	1,221,200	833,000
United Arab Republic: Vegetable Improvement and Seed Production Research Center, Dokki.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	1,169,900	551,900	618,000
Singapore: Light industries service unit.....	do.....	ILO.....	5	1,440,100	578,100	871,000
Uruguay: Animal production and grasslands program at the Alberto Boerger Agricultural Research Center, La Estanzuela.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	2,282,800	1,100,800	1,182,000
Venezuela:						
Preinvestment survey on forestry development in Venezuelan Guiana.....	do.....	FAO.....	4	1,721,500	598,500	1,123,000
Training Center for Telecommunication Technicians, Caracas.....	do.....	ITU.....	4	4,878,100	1,110,100	3,768,000
The Americas: Caribbean fishery development project ²	do.....	FAO.....	4	2,221,200	1,448,400	772,800
Asia: Asian Institute of Economic Development ³	do.....	U.N.....	5	4,259,300	3,536,300	723,000

¹ The Government's cash payments toward local operating costs are included under "Governing council earmarkings" and not under "Government counterpart contribution."

² Requesting governments: Dominican, Haiti, Jamaica, Trinidad, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, British Guiana, Barbados, Antigua, St. Kitts and Cayman, and Puerto Rico.

³ Requesting governments: Burma, Ceylon, China, Malaya, India, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines, South Korea, South Vietnam, Thailand, Hong Kong, Sarawak, and Singapore.

THE CUBAN PROBLEM

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night at the Statler Hilton, no less a spokesman for the administration than the Vice President publicly acknowledged that criticism of its failures in Cuban policy was hurting. The Vice President cried foul. He claimed that criticism of the Cuban situation threatens to paralyze the Government and weaken or destroy public confidence in the President.

The unhappy fact, Mr. Speaker, is that widespread lack of confidence in this administration's policy on Cuba exists throughout the country at this minute. This existing lack of confidence goes far beyond Cuban policy. But Cuba is perhaps the best and most recent example of this administration's misrepresentations, half-truths, and untruths to the American people.

It has gotten so we just do not know whether what is reported by the White House or the Department of Defense concerning pressing present issues is the whole truth. This is a tragedy of this administration's own creation. The situation was not developed by Republican criticism. This only helped bring it to view. It is the product of deliberate and intentional misconduct on the part of an administration that is so politically minded it would even play politics with the national survival.

But the Vice President last night did not confine his complaint of Republican criticism to the contention it was unpatriotic. He also raised the smoke-screen of interference with separation of powers. He suggested that the problem was executive not legislative. He knows better.

Mr. Speaker, this administration is acutely sensitive to growing public awareness that the United States is in an increasingly difficult and dangerous situation because of blunders on the part of this Democrat administration. Its indecision and its abdication of the Monroe Doctrine have been interpreted by many people, some our friends, as calamitous and little short of cowardice in the face of Communist aggression in our own backyard.

Constructive public comment on these dismal facts is not partisan. It is not unpatriotic. Neither is its effects on government paralytic.

When such criticism includes positive recommendations to solve the immensely important Cuban problem by a specific recommended course of action it is in the best traditions of the doctrine of separation of powers. Such is the function of Congress. The floor of this great body is open to debate in depth should differences of opinion arise.

The immediate key to application of the Monroe Doctrine to the Cuban problem at this moment is the pressing need for on-site inspection of the island. The need to take a look in our own backyard

to see what capacity for our destruction communism hides there. Beyond the immediate need for inspection lies the problem of a plebiscite for the Cuban people after a period of military government so that we can have smiles and freedom again on this once peace-loving island.

After all this it must become an essential concept of American foreign policy that this hemisphere will be kept free of communism even if it takes the promise or the use of American armed force to keep it free.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's speech last night is proof that the administration knows it is vulnerable; knows that we are in deep trouble because of its weakness. It seeks to still the voices of constructive criticism by crying foul. We accept the challenge. Those of us who believe deeply that our policy must show a new firmness and direction, dedicate ourselves to helpfulness rather than partisanship.

We do this because this issue is all important. It is indeed the issue of national survival. On this we know that, regardless of party, the people are with us. If this administration would mortgage the national survival on the altar of political expediency, then let us prove to America that the Republican Party will have no part of Democrat abandonment of principle and Democrat destruction of the Monroe Doctrine that is the record of the Kennedy administration to its everlasting shame.

H.R. 4831—A PLAN FOR FEDERAL AID TO HELP THE STATES SOLVE THEIR CRISIS IN CHARITY HOSPITALS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 4831. This legislation would amend the Hill-Burton Act to make more funds available for the exclusive purposes of helping States meet the mounting problem of providing adequate hospital care for their indigents who are recipients of public welfare payments.

This legislation has been suggested by Mr. Seymour Simon, of Chicago, who is president of the Cook County Board of Commissioners. Mr. Simon has recently been advised that the huge Cook County Hospital, which is under his jurisdiction, is threatened with the loss of accreditation if it fails to correct a serious problem of overcrowding which exists in the hospital today.

The people of Chicago and Cook County have just completed spending \$35 million on a vast rehabilitation and modernization program in the Cook County Hospital. This hospital today stands as one of the outstanding institutions in the world of medical care and medical research. Only yesterday we read that the applications for internship at the Cook County Hospital far ex-

ceeded the number of interns the hospital can accept this year. This tremendous desire on the part of interns to complete their medical training at the Cook County Hospital demonstrates again what a fantastically high professional reputation this great hospital has.

However, Mr. Speaker, we have reached that point in Chicago and Cook County where the people of my community can no longer absorb the capital outlay necessary to expand the hospital's facilities in order to overcome the overcrowding.

I think it is only proper, therefore, that Mr. Simon should suggest that part of this responsibility be absorbed by the Federal Government. This is by no means a case of a local official reaching out to the Federal Government for assistance whenever a local community cannot meet its problems with its own resources.

Mr. Speaker, Seymour Simon is writing a tremendous record in Cook County as president of his county board. I wish to assure this House that he is not one of those individuals who call on the Federal Government for constant assistance. The people of Chicago and Cook County are fortunate to have Mr. Simon as president of the county board because of his thorough understanding and knowledge of the problems in our community. This House may be assured that if Mr. Simon has suggested some form of Federal assistance to meet the present crisis, it is only after carefully studying all other possible avenues of help at the local and State level. Surely his recommendation is based on the firm knowledge that this problem cannot be solved through local resources only.

It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that we are the most mobile nation in the world. In no other country do people move from one community to another as much as do our American citizens. This tremendous mobility creates vast problems, particularly for urban areas throughout America.

I am sure there is not a Member in this Congress who is not aware of the fact that with the exodus of America's rural residents into large urban areas, we now see the dilemma of 78 percent of the American population living in urban areas and only 22 percent residing in local communities. The movement off the farm continues, and with it the problems of urban areas mount. This, therefore, is the reason I have introduced this legislation today.

Under my proposal, Mr. Speaker, we would appropriate \$150 million a year for the next 5 years to help the States meet this problem of providing hospital care to the indigent. My proposal would take the public charitable hospitals out of the present Hill-Burton Act and thus make available for distribution to the States assistance in the form of grants in aid to nonprofit hospitals the entire \$150 million now included in the existing Hill-Burton Act.

The new appropriation of an additional \$150 million a year for the next 5 years would be earmarked exclusively for construction of public eleemosynary hospitals. This \$150 million annually would

be distributed among 50 States based on a formula of the number of public assistance recipients that they have in their respective States as compared to the total U.S. population of public welfare recipients.

This means that the State of Alabama, which has 204,000 recipients of public assistance, would receive slightly more than \$4 million a year because that State's public welfare recipients constitute 2.74 percent of the Nation's total population receiving public assistance, which numbers 7,642,556.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will list all of the 50 States and the amount of money they would receive annually. Under my bill, a State would decide how its allotment is to be distributed within the State.

For the purposes of this act, the term "general assistance" means money payments or medical care received by needy individuals under a program established by State law or by an ordinance of a political subdivision of a State but does not include any such payments or care received by any inmate of any public penal or correctional institution.

The number of individuals receiving general assistance in any State and in all the States shall be the average monthly number of such individuals for the most recent year for which satisfactory data, as determined by the Surgeon General, is available for all the States.

Illinois, which has 429,000 recipients of public assistance, would receive approximately \$8½ million a year. Since more than half of these assistance recipients reside in Cook County, it is reasonable to assume that Cook County would receive at least one-half of the Federal allotment. Assuming this to be true, in the next 5 years Cook County would receive somewhere in the vicinity of \$20 million in Federal assistance to meet its needs at the Cook County Hospital.

With the adoption of this program, the Cook County Board of Commissioners could proceed almost immediately to build a 600-bed addition at the Cook County Hospital, for a cost estimated at \$24 million, which would then meet the demands of the Hospital Accreditation Committee.

My bill provides that Federal funds can be used to finance up to 90 percent of the cost of additions or improvements or even new eleemosynary hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to support reductions in other Government spending to make funds for my proposal available. I believe this legislation is sound. We established long ago the principle in the Hill-Burton Act that the Federal Government should assist local communities in meeting their hospital needs. However, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that by commingling the needs of our public nonprofit hospitals with our public eleemosynary hospitals, the \$150 million now appropriated does not begin to meet the needs of our Nation's communities.

I firmly believe that by making the present Hill-Burton appropriation available entirely as grants-in-aid to our nonprofit hospitals and then making an additional \$150 million available exclusively as grants-in-aid to the States for

meeting the needs of their public eleemosynary hospitals, we will strike a more realistic balance in helping communities of our Nation.

I invite my colleagues to join in co-sponsoring this legislation. A copy of the bill is included at the conclusion of my remarks today.

Distribution of \$150,000,000 proposed for Federal grants to States for construction of public hospitals based on distribution of average monthly number of recipients of public assistance, calendar year 1962

State	Average monthly number of recipients, calendar year 1962	Percent of U.S. total	Distribution of \$150,000,000
Total.....	7,462,556	100.00	\$150,000,000
Alabama.....	204,484	2.74	4,110,000
Alaska.....	6,409	.09	129,000
Arizona.....	59,287	.79	1,192,000
Arkansas.....	93,345	1.25	1,876,000
California.....	719,433	9.64	14,460,000
Colorado.....	96,100	1.29	1,932,000
Connecticut.....	69,033	.93	1,388,000
Delaware.....	13,469	.18	271,000
District of Columbia.....	29,984	.40	603,000
Florida.....	206,234	2.76	4,145,000
Georgia.....	190,402	2.55	3,827,000
Guam.....	1,203	.02	24,000
Hawaii.....	16,745	.22	337,000
Idaho.....	118,550	1.58	2,373,000
Illinois.....	429,366	5.75	8,630,000
Indiana.....	173,505	2.32	3,558,000
Iowa.....	83,570	1.12	1,680,000
Kansas.....	65,864	.88	1,324,000
Kentucky.....	154,197	2.07	3,090,000
Louisiana.....	248,245	3.33	4,990,000
Maine.....	45,155	.61	908,000
Maryland.....	78,525	1.05	1,578,000
Massachusetts.....	173,469	2.32	3,487,000
Michigan.....	320,554	4.29	6,443,000
Minnesota.....	116,662	1.56	2,345,000
Mississippi.....	177,019	2.37	3,558,000
Missouri.....	246,270	3.30	4,950,000
Montana.....	19,886	.27	400,000
Nebraska.....	32,371	.43	651,000
Nevada.....	7,750	.10	156,000
New Hampshire.....	12,344	.17	248,000
New Jersey.....	133,356	1.79	2,681,000
New Mexico.....	44,057	.59	880,000
New York.....	571,080	7.65	11,478,000
North Carolina.....	188,399	2.52	3,787,000
North Dakota.....	17,273	.23	347,000
Ohio.....	334,492	4.48	7,228,000
Oklahoma.....	188,378	2.52	3,786,000
Oregon.....	65,115	.88	1,323,000
Pennsylvania.....	428,768	5.75	8,618,000
Puerto Rico.....	290,571	3.89	5,841,000
Rhode Island.....	34,274	.46	689,000
South Carolina.....	76,870	1.03	1,545,000
South Dakota.....	20,943	.28	421,000
Tennessee.....	156,129	2.09	3,138,000
Texas.....	341,140	4.57	6,857,000
Utah.....	30,830	.41	620,000
Vermont.....	14,051	.19	282,000
Virgin Islands.....	2,065	.03	42,000
Virginia.....	71,395	.96	1,435,000
Washington.....	122,082	1.64	2,454,000
West Virginia.....	161,059	2.16	3,237,000
Wisconsin.....	104,749	1.40	2,105,000
Wyoming.....	8,100	.11	163,000

¹ Excludes recipients under general assistance program; State agency does not report these data. Each State's allotment would be altered slightly as the figures for Indiana and Idaho become available.

H.R. 4831

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a special program for the construction, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of public eleemosynary hospitals

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 621 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291d) is amended by striking out "construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals" and inserting in lieu thereof "construction of public hospitals, other than public eleemosynary hospitals, and other nonprofit hospitals".

(b) Subsection (e) of section 631 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291a (e)) is amended by inserting "(1)" immedi-

ately after "(e)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) the term 'public eleemosynary hospital' means any hospital owned or operated by a State or political subdivision of a State or any agency or instrumentality of a State or such a political subdivision in which all patients are treated and attended by physicians who treat or attend such patients without reimbursement or receive reimbursement therefor only from the public entity owning or operating such hospital."

(c) Subsection (k) of such section 631 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) In the case of any project for the construction of a public eleemosynary hospital which is approved after the effective date of this paragraph, the Federal share shall be up to 90 per centum of the cost of the construction of such project."

SEC. 2. (a) Title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., subchapter IV) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART I—CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMOSYNARY HOSPITALS"

"Authorization of appropriations"

"SEC. 671. In order to assist the States in carrying out the purposes of section 601(b) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like sum for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for the construction of public eleemosynary hospitals.

"Allotments to States"

"SEC. 672. (a) Each State for which a State plan has been submitted and approved under section 623 prior to or during a fiscal year shall be entitled for such year to an allotment of a sum bearing the same ratio to the amount appropriated pursuant to section 671 for such fiscal year as the number of individuals receiving general assistance in such State bears to the aggregate of individuals receiving general assistance in all the States.

"(b) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'general assistance' means money payments or medical care received by needy individuals under a program established by State law or by an ordinance of a political subdivision of a State, but does not include any such payments or care received by an inmate of any public penal or correctional institution;

"(2) the number of individuals receiving general assistance in any State and in all the States shall be the average monthly number of such individuals for the most recent year for which satisfactory data, as determined by the Surgeon General, are available for all the States.

"Approval of projects"

"SEC. 673. For each project for construction of a public eleemosynary hospital, there shall be submitted to the Surgeon General through the State agency (designated as provided in section 623(a)(1)) an application by the State or a political subdivision thereof. Such application shall set forth—

"(1) a description of the site for such project;

"(2) plans and specifications therefor in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Surgeon General under section 622(e);

"(3) reasonable assurance that title, as defined in section 631(j), to such site is or will be vested in the applicant or in the public entity which is to operate the hospital;

"(4) reasonable assurance that adequate financial support will be available for the construction of the project and for its maintenance and operation when completed; and

"(5) reasonable assurance that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in construction of the project will be not less than the prevailing local wage rates

for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law 403 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended.

The Surgeon General shall approve any such application if (A) sufficient funds to pay the Federal share of the cost of construction of such project are available from the allotment to the State made under section 672; (B) it has been approved and recommended by the State agency and is entitled to priority over other projects for the construction of public eleemosynary hospitals within the State in accordance with the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 622(d); and (C) such project is in conformity with the State plan approved under section 623. No application shall be disapproved until the Surgeon General has afforded the applicant an opportunity for a hearing.

"Payments"

"Sec. 674. (a) Upon approving an application under this part, the Surgeon General shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount equal to the Federal share of the estimated cost of construction of the project and designate the appropriation from which it is to be paid. Such certification shall provide for payments to the State. Upon certification by the State agency, based upon inspection by it, that work has been performed upon a project, or purchases have been made, in accordance with the approved plans and specifications, and that payment of an installment is due to the applicant, the Surgeon General shall certify such installment for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury; except that if the Surgeon General, after investigation or otherwise, has ground to believe that a default has occurred requiring action pursuant to section 632(a) he may, upon giving notice of hearing pursuant to such subsection, withhold certification pending action based on such hearing.

"(b) Amendment of any approved application shall be subject to approval in the same manner as an original application. Certification under subsection (a) may be amended, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of a project. An amended certification may direct that any additional payment be made from the applicable allotment for the fiscal year in which such amended certification is made.

"(c) The funds paid under this section for the construction of an approved project shall be used solely for carrying out such project as so approved."

(b) Clause (1) of subsection (f) of section 622 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291e(f)(1)) is amended by striking out the comma immediately preceding "but" and all that follows through the word "group".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on July 1, 1963; except that such amendments, other than the amendment made by section 2(b) of this Act, shall not apply to any project for the construction of a public eleemosynary hospital, if an application with respect to such hospital was approved under section 625 of the Public Health Service Act before July 1, 1963.

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

MARCH 13, 1963.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Office of the Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I deeply regret to advise you that I will not be able to serve as a

delegate to the meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group which will meet at Guanajuato, Mexico, March 18-21, 1963.

Circumstances have arisen which make it necessary for me to remain in Washington during those days. I particularly regret such action because of my interest in Mexican-American affairs. I was looking forward with great anticipation to this third interparliamentary meeting.

Your kindness in designating me as a delegate is most appreciated. I hope that this necessary change of plans at this late date will not cause an inconvenience to you.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,

Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in the Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMERON] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR COLLEGE TUITION

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to permit tax deductions for college tuition and other educational expenses.

This proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code is one way in which the Federal Government can offer direct encouragement of higher education. Further, it can be accomplished without Federal control or regulation.

The costs of higher education in our country have risen sharply in recent years—well above the general cost index climb. Those who shoulder this burden—parents or students, themselves—are entitled to more equitable tax treatment.

Specifically, this bill will allow a taxpayer to deduct from gross income tuition and certain other educational expenses paid for his education, the education of his spouse, or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning.

Laboratory, library, field study, enrollment, and other fees and charges, as well as the costs of the required textbooks will be deductible under the provisions of the bill. However, it will not permit a tax deduction for unrelated expenses such as room, board, and travel.

I urge Congress to pay particular attention to this area as it deliberates the many tax reduction and reform bills which will come before it in the days ahead.

PROBE OF U.S. INTERESTS SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I disclosed on the floor of the House late yesterday afternoon that a naturalized American citizen who has received some \$32 million in U.S. Government-insured loans has a substantial interest in oversea companies which account for some 30 percent of all current non-Communist shipping to Communist Cuba.

This man's name is Manuel E. Kulukundis. He was naturalized on June 20, 1955, and lives in New York. As I stated earlier, he curiously obtained a fleet of surplus World War II U.S. vessels purchased under the Ship Sales Act of 1946 the same day he obtained U.S. citizenship; and purchase of the Government surplus vessels had been previously questioned because he was not an American citizen.

Since that time Kulukundis has received some \$32 million in U.S. Government-insured loans which have helped underwrite his worldwide shipping operations.

In my remarks to the House yesterday I revealed that during the summer months of 1962, Kulukundis ships accounted for 10 percent of all free world shipping to Cuba, and that 12 of the 14 Kulukundis ships were tankers carrying vital Soviet cargos from parts inside the U.S.S.R.

From facts I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last night accompanied by information now in my possession I firmly feel sufficient evidence now exists to initiate full investigation by appropriate committees of Congress into the entire operations of this citizen of convenience.

WELCOME TO ELGIN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 10, 1963, South Carolina's newest industry officially held open house on the occasion of the dedication of its new watch plant at Elgin, S.C., in Kershaw County, in my district. The public was invited.

In the Columbia (S.C.) State of Saturday, March 9, 1963, there appeared an almost full-page advertisement of invitation and I quote:

Elgin National Watch Co. cordially invites you to attend the dedication of its new watch plant at Elgin [formerly Blaney] Sunday, March 10, 3 p.m. at the plant site [Kershaw County]. Program includes an open house and plant tour. Refreshments will be served. Bring the family this Sunday and meet Elgin, South Carolina's newest industry.

We are proud to have the Elgin National Watch Co. come to South Caro-

lina. We welcome them with all the hospitality at our command, and we salute the great efforts of all those who made the plant a reality. We were privileged to have visiting us in South Carolina, on the occasion of the opening, the president and the chairman of the board, and three directors of Elgin National Watch Co., who headed the list of Elgin executives participating in the firm's plant dedication.

Henry M. Margolis, president and board chairman, attended with his lovely wife and son.

Among the directors who attended were William C. Croft, president, Pyle National Co.—a South Carolina native who has made good in the business world; A. Phillip Goldsmith, chairman of the board, Bates Fabrics, Inc.; and Charles F. Willis, Jr., president, Alaska Air Lines, Inc. In addition, eight members of the Elgin management of the company's general offices at Elgin, Ill., participated in the dedication. The Honorable John C. West, able senator of Kershaw County, S.C., was master of ceremonies. He introduced the Reverend Dean Clyde, pastor of the Blaney Baptist Church who gave the invocation. Then, appropriately, we had "The Star-Spangled Banner." There is nothing unusual about this; in South Carolina we put God first and the country next.

Then Senator West introduced the various platform guests including those I have already named who did us high honor by attending the dedication. He also introduced ex-Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, whose efforts in obtaining the plant were saluted by Senator West and others on the program. Senator STROM THURMOND was present to honor us with his presence. Then Senator West introduced President Henry M. Margolis, who made the dedication address.

It had been my hope that I would be able to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of the address of this great businessman, symbolic of the free enterprise system of this great Nation. Since I do not have the text, I will try to highlight the significant facts he brought out.

Of the 25 million watches sold in 1962 in the United States of America, only 1,250,000 were manufactured in the United States. Not only are we failing to produce for our own people, but we are letting imports take away from our people the possibility of jobs working in the watch factories of this Nation. Mr. Margolis significantly contrasted the production in Russia, where in 1961, the Russians produced 25 million watches, and took pride in the fact that they had developed that many technicians to do the intricate handwork necessary to assemble the watches.

He pointed out to us the problem involved in the import situation. Eighty percent of the cost of producing an Elgin watch, or any other American watch, is labor. We pay the highest prices in the world for labor, and we are proud of that fact, but we are competing with foreign manufacturers who pay as little as 30 cents an hour for their labor.

The courageous president of this company exhibited the magnificent courage

which is typical of the management of his company. He stated that if his company was expendable, they were not going to cry about it, but they had to be convinced that it was in the best interest of the Nation. Meanwhile, he expressed the determination of his entire personnel to face the tasks and meet the challenges before them. They intend to put out the best watches in the world—and they will. They intend to integrate the National Elgin Watch Co. into any defense effort this country may make, and he told of the training of the fine people of the community of the work which they had to do.

He related the history of the Elgin plant coming to South Carolina. Less than 6 months before March 10, the ground had been broken, and on the occasion of the dedication, approximately 220 people were gainfully employed in the production of fine watches.

He saluted the fine people of Kershaw County, and the surrounding areas who have assimilated the training offered and are giving excellent effort in their new jobs at the plant. I am sure much of the credit for this is due Mr. A. H. Buhrow, plant manager, who was on the speakers' platform.

We were all inspired by the address of this fine businessman. He dedicated his plant to America, to usefulness for the purposes of this great country. I felt that we were listening to a big patriot of a patriotic organization.

Later he presented Gov. Donald S. Russell with a magnificent timepiece. Governor Russell responded to the dedication address in the fine fashion so characteristic of this brilliant new chief executive of South Carolina. He welcomed not only the Elgin plant, but all of its officials, to the warmth and hospitality of South Carolina, and told Mr. Margolis that we would consider him an honorary citizen of our great State, and presented to him a flag of the State of South Carolina to be flown over the new plant.

After the ceremony, Mr. Margolis made an appropriate reply. He then presented Senator John C. West with the first watch, a fitting tribute to the untiring efforts of Senator West in bringing the plant to South Carolina.

I think it significant that on the inside cover of the program, Mr. Margolis had also included a very timely statement. We quote from that statement:

In 1864, the Elgin National Watch Co. was incorporated in Chicago and shortly thereafter its first plant was built in nearby Elgin, Ill. Since the first Elgin watch was delivered from the hands of its early craftsmen, Elgin timepieces have never ceased ticking away the seconds, counting the minutes and hours for millions of persons throughout the world. And during three wars, Elgin has contributed importantly to our Nation's defense as a producer of specialized timing mechanisms.

Today, nearly 100 years later, Elgin is proud to dedicate its newest watch plant here in Elgin, S.C. This first phase of our operation here contains 72,000-square feet of space, and features the most advanced equipment, air conditioning and dehumidifying systems. Without doubt, it is the most modern and efficient watch assembly operation in the United States, and possibly the world.

The role of Elgin in South Carolina is a most significant one in the company's plans to maintain and expand its preeminence in the watchmaking field in the United States. To the people who are the Elgin National Watch Co. in South Carolina, therefore, we look for the same skills and dedication that have characterized Elgin's long and successful history of fine watchmaking. We hope also that in the future plants serving other Elgin operations can be located here.

As production of watches becomes a reality in South Carolina, we wish to extend our deepest appreciation for the outstanding cooperation and help from the many people and organizations who have made this new industry possible. We take great pride in becoming a member of your community and thank you for your warm welcome. And we look forward to a long and pleasant relationship with those who have worked so diligently on our behalf.

Also included in the statement was a news story released to the press on February 27, 1963, describing a significant Elgin contribution to U.S. space exploration activities. The news story is as follows:

DOWNNEY, CALIF.—The Elgin National Watch Co.'s Research and Development Division, Rolling Meadows, Ill., was selected by North American Aviation's Space and Information Systems Division to develop and build the unique timekeeping device for the Apollo command module. The device is an electronic metronome with an infallible sense of timing that will call the signals on board NASA's moon-bound Apollo spacecraft.

The Apollo spacecraft, which is under the direction of NASA's manned-spacecraft center, Houston, Tex., is scheduled to take three Americans on a round trip to the moon for scientific research by 1970.

The award to the Illinois firm was the 17th major selection by North American Aviation's Space and Information Systems Division, principal contractor for the Apollo command and service modules. The 17 companies have received awards totaling more than \$128 million, and are located in 10 States.

The electronic timekeeper will be to moon-bound astronauts what the automatic clock radio and electric timer are to the contemporary housewife.

It will receive its synchronization from the on-board guidance and navigation computer. The computer solves a problem, then synchronizes the timekeeper to count cadence and send the signal to start or stop an operation.

With a required flight and ground check-out operating life of about 2,000 hours, the space-age timepiece will be called upon to keep the spacecraft television, telemetry, and on-board test equipment synchronized.

It will also provide clock pulses to the sequencer which will jettison the Apollo escape tower as the huge three-stage advanced Saturn C-V space vehicle breaks the magnetic bounds of earth.

The electronic metronome will be a little black box about the size of a loaf of bread and will weigh less than 10 pounds. With the equivalent of 4,800 parts tucked away, some small as a pinhead, but none larger than a golf ball, the device will utilize the most recent developments in microminiature circuitry, recording for later analysis elapsed time between major events such as retrorocket firings.

The robot timekeeper will have a redundancy (emergency backup feature) that will guarantee 1-million-to-1 odds against failure.

Its passion for accuracy will be equaled only by the National Bureau of Standards,

with which the timekeeper will be synchronized before plug-in to the command module.

Senator West also introduced some of the ladies present: Mrs. Henry Margolis; South Carolina's first lady, Virginia Russell; Mrs. Robert W. Hemphill, and Mrs. Elizabeth Dixon; then Senator and Mrs. George McKeown, of Cherokee County, S.C., and Senator and Mrs. Dan Laney, of Lee County, S.C. Singled out in the audience were Commissioner Les Myers, of Kershaw County; E. T. Bowen, of Elgin; Howard Speaks, Ed Mitchell, and Frank Rector, of Camden, S.C., and E. C. Potter, mayor of Elgin. Time did not permit further introduction.

A crowd of 5,000 people attended the dedication. The benediction was given by the Reverend Milton McGuirt, pastor of the Elgin Methodist Church.

A silent host at the dedication was our own country. Through the magnificent efforts of the Area Redevelopment Administration of the Department of Commerce of the United States of America, a water system at Blaney, S.C., now Elgin, S.C., evolved from a dream to reality. As Senator West so gratuitously pointed out—without water we could not have hoped to have this magnificent plant. I salute the Area Redevelopment Administration, its helpful officials, its employees at the Washington level and in the Atlanta regional office, for their magnificent cooperation and help in getting water for Blaney. This is the kind of fruitfulness the Area Redevelopment Administration was designed to be a part of. Industry, investment, jobs, salaries, productivity, all a reality. And throughout all, the preservation and promotion of the free enterprise system that has made America great.

Like many others sitting on the platform on that beautiful Sunday afternoon, I could look out over the heads of the crowd and see in the distance the horizons which our eyesight limited us. I was too realistic to think that I could see beyond the horizon, or prophesy what might happen to us. I could only say a little prayer of thankfulness that we have people in industry like President Margolis and the people who came to do us honor in the dedication on that Sunday. I feel confident that with people of such caliber, together with the people of the locality who have made a magnificent stride in coming untrained from the farms and the homes, and learning the skilled talents of assembling watches.

After the ceremony a fine tour of the plant was arranged. Courtesy was the watchword and hospitality the order of the day.

It was a great day in South Carolina on Sunday.

Welcome, Elgin. We are happy to have you, proud of you, and we hope that in the future the great name of Elgin will be synonymous with the great name of the State of South Carolina.

CONSENSUS ON CUBA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, there exists today what I believe to be a rough consensus of opinion on one of the most vexing problems with which the United States has had to deal in recent years—I am referring to the Cuban situation. This consensus has been shaped and hammered out by means of public debate; very few other foreign policy or national security issues have been submitted to such an intensive interchange of ideas and evaluations as has the Cuban problem.

Public opinion and the governmental policymaking machinery have had sufficient exposure to this problem for the past 4 years to have sifted the wheat from the chaff of this debate; to have eliminated certain extreme or rash solutions; and to have observed the effects of various actions on the part of our Government on the viability of the Havana regime. This has helped to pare the Cuban debate to the bone, to the relevant heart of the matter. I believe that it is necessary at this time to initiate an evaluation of this consensus, with a view to measuring the pertinence of the steps toward solution which our Government has taken to date, and in order to provide the basis for recommendations for future steps to which I add my own views. The debate, in other words, must move with all responsibility forward into new areas of consideration.

The role of the loyal opposition has on occasion been called into question during this debate. Let us put this behind us permanently; what is involved is the security of the United States of America. In our concern for this, we are all united. I believe that constructive debate can and does serve a vital function in a democracy—that of exposing policy to public scrutiny, in which crucible a policy survives or falls on the combined interests of the American people.

It is in this crucible of lengthy public consideration and debate that a distinguishable consensus of opinion on the Cuban problem has been distilled. I am grateful to many of my distinguished colleagues in both bodies of this Congress for providing some of the more recent and valuable debating material which has served to finally sharpen and focus the public's appreciation of the Cuban problem, and to stimulate our National Government's responsibility in meeting that problem.

Let me turn now to what is my interpretation of this consensus of opinion about Cuba. First, there seems to be wide agreement on one fundamental issue. We want to settle the problem without invading Cuba, if it is humanly possible.

This feeling is tempered by another, equally strong: The problem must be solved. The United States cannot accept the continued presence of Soviet military power in the Western Hemisphere. Containment is not enough: Soviet troops in Cuba present an intolerable situation. This is true for many reasons, and people may differ on why they agree that this is so, but they do agree that there must be a withdrawal of Soviet forces from the island. The problem of how to do this, of course, is one which can be faced when we are in agree-

ment, and the executive branch is in agreement, that it should be done.

This brings us to the third point of consensus on the Cuban problem. And that is that our Government has not found an effective policy of solving the Cuban problem so far. I am not going to go into criticism of specific points of policy. I simply mean to point out that Fidel Castro has been in power in Cuba for 4 years, and that there has been a Soviet military presence in Cuba for some time, and that this presence brought the world to the brink last October, and that it continues to menace hemispheric security, and that Cuba as a base for the training of saboteurs and agitators is increasing, not decreasing, the security of the American States. The consensus is that Cuba is an obvious problem to which we have not found a solution, obvious or otherwise.

Another point in this consensus is that if the Monroe Doctrine has been multilateralized as an instrument of hemispheric security, then it must serve as an instrument of our security as well as our neighbors.

It has been pointed out that if the doctrine was multilateralized it was in order to keep the United States from unilaterally invoking it according to its own interpretation. There are many who disagree with this opinion.

But there can be no legal question about the security treaties between the American States, including OAS. The Rio Treaty signed to circumvent the necessity to resort to the Monroe Doctrine, must, in its stead, provide for our security. Under this treaty we can invoke any kind of sanction, including military, in order to avoid a threat to the security of the American States. It is time all the American people realize that we have a solid legal basis for our firm insistence that the Soviet military establishment get out of Cuba.

In this respect, I should point out many have found sadly lacking the support for actions against the Castro regime on the part of the organization of American States. I am speaking now not only of precipitant military actions, but even the simple diplomatic, economic, and commercial sanctions provided for in the treaty. Some nations have not even broken off relations with the Castro regime, despite the missile crisis in October, and the Cuban embassies in these countries continue to serve as focal distribution points of propaganda and subversives, continue to provide means of traveling to Cuba for guerrilla training, and continue in general to dissipate and fragment the actions of those American States which are concerned about Cuban troublemaking. An honestly debatable question is: Has the administration exerted sufficient leadership, or sufficient pressure, to bring the members of the Organization of American States into agreement about sanctions on the Cuban espionage and sabotage center?

For myself, I feel we have been sorely lacking a policy on Cuba. I don't think the administration has really developed a clear policy about Cuba or the Western Hemisphere with respect to its freedom. I feel we must emphasize to all the peoples of the world that we have made no

commitments that prevent us from continuing the embargo—quarantine if you will—or from taking stronger action if it is essential to our security or to the peace and freedom of this hemisphere. The President should make it clear that his hands are completely untied as to quarantine or any action required for the security of this hemisphere. I feel we should have a powerful defense organization for the Caribbean States and Central America. I feel we should use every means at our command to curb shipments of goods to Cuba by our allies. And we have our own economic assistance program as a meaningful tool to end this sham. How ridiculous can we be to allow what is still going on daily to continue? Here we give economic assistance and maintain broad trade agreements with many countries which, in turn, assist Cuba's economy and strengthen Castro, often providing our own goods, our own machinery parts and replacements so vital to Castro's productivity. We should carry out our threat to withdraw our aid to the nations violating this basic principle of morality and justice. The President has this authority; he should use it.

I feel it is necessary to insist on the withdrawal of Soviet troops—to relieve this uncertainty which dominates our minds regarding the existence of vast Soviet troops and weapons which could strike at us or other vital points in the Western Hemisphere. I am convinced that if these Soviet forces are removed that they will take with them most of the weapons they brought there, thus removing the most potent tools Castroism has in this hemisphere. This brings me to another thought.

What on earth is this question of offensive or defensive threat? What difference does it make? The Soviets have not brought thousands of troops and millions of rubles worth of equipment into Cuba to bask in the Cuban sun. The important thing is that there is this huge Soviet military buildup in the Caribbean 90 miles from our shores—brazenly and defiantly dedicated to the subversion and the threat to security of our hemisphere. It does not matter if it is offensive or defensive. What does matter is that the Soviet buildup has turned Cuba into a base for subversion and terrorism throughout the hemisphere.

Castro, buttressed by this Soviet strength, makes no secret of his aims. "Ché" Guevara, his principal strategist said publicly just a few months ago that the Soviet Union from its Cuban base intends to use every means to spread its influence throughout Latin America, stimulating unrest and guerrilla warfare to weaken or topple neighboring governments. He emphasized that there is no solution but armed struggle to overthrow these governments. Guevara admitted that guerrillas in Paraguay, in Guatemala, Colombia, and Venezuela are already active in armed struggle and that guerrilla groups also have been inciting clashes in Nicaragua and Peru. What more do we need.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the Cuban problem is not a simple one, but I am convinced that it is a vital one to this Nation's security. My purpose to-

day in bringing up these points has been to suggest that a rough sort of consensus has been arrived at about the Cuban problem, and that now, on the basis of, and operating within this consensus, we ought to turn the ongoing debate onto responsible measures to solve, or at least to reduce, the problem to acceptable dimensions.

Public concern over the Cuban imbroglio has assumed many forms and has covered a wide range of evaluations of the problem and possible avenues to explore toward its solution.

Toward this end I trust a bold policy will emanate, and I am confident that the whole country will unite behind whatever firm action the President recommends to remove this menace. Of course we should have a bipartisan policy. But, to paraphrase Senator KEATING, bipartisanship does not mean blind man's buff. It means alert, open-minded support for actions the President takes in pursuit of U.S. objectives. When the President acts—whether successfully as in October, or unsuccessfully as at the Bay of Pigs—he can expect bipartisan backing with no recriminations. However, and I emphasize this, there must be a definite policy to expect bipartisan support. When there is no policy, except wait and see, then, all citizens, yes, and Members of Congress, have a responsibility to make their views known. I believe that continued expressions of American concern over the Soviet threat in our hemisphere are very much in the national interest. They can only strengthen the President's hand in dealing with the Soviets and convincing them that we are determined to put an end to their military activities in the Caribbean.

One such expression of concern has been forwarded to me recently by a group of young citizens from my native borough of Queens in New York. It is contained in a resolution adopted by the Queens County Young Republican Association of which Gordon L. Busching, of Kew Gardens, serves as president. The resolution was drafted by Z. Michael Szaz, Ph. D., a member of the graduate faculty of the History Department of St. John's University, a noted author of numerous books and scholarly articles, and a recent panelist at the International Political Science Association's congress in Paris.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON THE CUBAN SITUATION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED BY THE QUEENS COUNTY YOUNG REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 27, 1963

Whereas the Soviet Union, by deployment of military forces, political subversion and economic domination, has established a hostile Communist base in the Western Hemisphere in Cuba in contravention of the Monroe Doctrine;

Whereas during the fall of 1962 offensive missile weapons were dispatched by the Soviet Union to Cuba and, though allegedly withdrawn the promise of a ground inspection of the dismantled bases was never implemented;

Whereas the Cuban Communist government and its Sino-Soviet and satellite experts and training personnel are actively engaged in subverting the political and social order of free countries in Latin Amer-

ica and are maintaining an excessive weapons arsenal;

Whereas the Communist rulers of the Cuban nation have established a totalitarian police regime against the wishes and interests of the Cuban people; and

Whereas the United States remains the main military, political and economic bulwark of free nations locked into a lethal struggle with international communism and has to act in its own and its allies' interests Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee recommends the following actions: The U.S. Government shall, by extending a short time limit, demand from the Cuban and Soviet Governments that a ground and air inspection of missile and air bases be permitted under the supervision of the Organization of American States.

If such a demand is not complied with, the U.S. Government should be forced to decree a complete embargo of all goods to Cuba by the ships of any nation and enforce it by all the means at our command, including if necessary the Armed Forces of the United States, and/or take any and all actions necessary to liquidate the Communist danger to the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I want to generally associate myself with the gentlemen who have been speaking out on this vital matter which is of such great interest to the American people. I have known Dr. Michael Szaz for many years and he brings a wide breadth of understanding to these subjects. I read with interest the resolution which has been incorporated into the RECORD by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] and I want to commend this fine group of young Republicans for their statement. Dr. Szaz is their inspirational leader.

Looking back to the statement by the President of the United States just before the 1962 election, I well recall the firmness of the President's position. His actions did not keep up with his words. In point six of his declaration he affirmed his intention to press the blockade of Cuba until adequate on-site inspection was accomplished. His abandonment of this position before such inspection was provided for has weakened our position throughout the world and certainly given wide latitude for action to Mr. Khrushchev who will not have to fear our strong words as long as Mr. Kennedy is in the White House.

I commend the gentleman for bringing this important message to the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks

at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DYNA-SOAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House passed H.R. 2440, a bill to authorize for the fiscal year 1964 procurement, research, development, tests, and evaluation of aircraft missiles and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. During the 4 hours of general debate on that bill the only real controversy had to do with the RS-70, previously known as the B-70. A great deal of time was consumed in discussing that project and there was not sufficient time available to me to bring up a subject which I think is also of great importance to the whole defense posture.

A new controversy seems in the making. Yesterday the Washington Daily News carried a big headline to the effect that the United States may scratch Dyna-Soar. The article in this paper indicated that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara may cancel the Air Force role in either Gemini or Dyna-Soar. For the information of the Members who are not acquainted with the various space projects, Gemini is a project to develop space rendezvous and docking techniques in orbit, using a two-man capsule. Dyna-Soar, which is also called the X-20A, is an Air Force project involving a manned, winged, glide reentry vehicle of orbital capability boosted by a Titan III launch vehicle. The Gemini is scheduled for flight tests beginning late this year and the Dyna-Soar is not scheduled for testing until 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the news item which appeared yesterday followed testimony made public by the House Armed Services Committee which indicated that Defense Secretary McNamara said he would not want to prejudge statements that have been made but his guess was that Gemini, as against Dyna-Soar, has a greater military potential for us. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the question to be decided is as to whether to continue with Dyna-Soar or modify Gemini for military purposes. Secretary McNamara is quoted as saying each spacecraft could cost \$800 million and before investing \$1.6 billion the Government probably would make a choice between them.

My purpose in rising today is not to tell the House that Secretary McNamara is about to make a mistake. Far from it—I have considerable respect for Mr. McNamara. One time I told him when he appeared before the Merchant Marine Committee that if he wanted to cut down a military establishment in my district and if he could show me that it was no longer needed I would support him.

In this case of the Dyna-Soar, which is being developed in the congressional

district adjoining mine, I would make the same statement. However, if I think the Secretary is wrong I will oppose him with equal directness. Especially I stress the matter of justification because when you are spending public funds and administering the public business you just do not make a decision and act without letting the people know why you make the decisions you do; or that is the way it should be.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to my colleague from Washington, in whose district the Dyna-Soar is being developed.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] to say if he believes there are political considerations in awarding or cancellation of contracts.

Mr. PELLY. I would say to my colleague that yesterday in the general debate it was made abundantly clear by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee that such a controversy is being looked into at the other end of the Capitol. Such influence or political consideration has been suspected.

I will say this too, I have a high regard for Secretary McNamara. Any political motivation in my judgment would not be of his deliberate doing. He is not such a man.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague the public needs for facts and reassurance on this score.

For example, the President, while campaigning in support of Mayor Richardson Dilworth's candidacy for Governor of Pennsylvania last fall, speaking at the McKeesport, Pa., city hall on October 13, 1962, said:

Working with Governor Lawrence since 1960, we have increased by 50 percent the number of prime defense contracts that come to Pennsylvania, job retraining, cleaning our rivers, area redevelopment, increasing our food supplies for those on relief—all these measures which can be brought about with a progressive, democratic Governor, working with all of us.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the President implied very pointedly that only by the election of a Democrat Governor could Pennsylvania expect to maintain or improve its present posture with respect to defense contracts.

It is known furthermore that all decisions on contract awards are channeled through the White House. Every award over \$1 million, I have been told, goes to the White House and thereafter to someone for political advantage in making a public announcement.

The public knows this. The public also knows there was an inference that if the President's brother was elected to the Senate it would be good for Massachusetts in obtaining defense business.

I would defend Mr. McNamara himself but as for this administration no one has convinced the public that there are not political considerations in these matters.

When the next election comes around, questions of this nature will be raised. Rightly so, too. I imagine my colleague will remind his constituents of what has transpired. But I certainly hold Mr. McNamara blameless—unless

someone shows to the contrary. I disagree with his reasons as to his decision on the TFX. It is a costly mistake to my mind.

As was said yesterday, Mr. McNamara is no military genius, but he is an executive and as such, of course, he will make honest blunders.

I do not want him to make any such wrong decision with regard to Dyna-Soar. That is why I am raising this issue today and writing into the RECORD what experts have testified regarding continuation of Dyna-Soar.

I certainly do not think Mr. McNamara is motivated by political consideration but somebody on the administration team that made this decision could have been politically motivated and I think that the public interest calls for more facts than have been revealed.

Mr. Speaker, when the question as to the possible striking of the Dyna-Soar program comes up there are some facts which I think Members of this House and the public should be given. For example, I think testimony of Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., who is the Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, before my Committee of Science and Astronautics on February 25, 1962, made certain things very clear insofar as the interest of science in connection with both the Dyna-Soar and the Gemini.

Let me cite what Dr. Seamans said in response to a question. I will read into the RECORD from the actual transcript. Mr. Hammill, a staff member of the Science and Astronautics Committee asked this question:

Mr. HAMMILL. Well now there are reports in the press to the effect that in view of the NASA-Air Force Gemini agreement that the Dyna-Soar program is being reevaluated within Defense.

Now the question is: Can Dyna-Soar and Gemini be distinguished as to objectives, because we understand Gemini to be looking toward maneuverability in space, rendezvous in docking and landing at a small preselected land site, which seems to me to be very similar to the objectives of Dyna-Soar.

Mr. SEAMANS. Well, it is true that all major programs are always under review and consequently Dyna-Soar is being thoroughly evaluated.

We in NASA feel that the two programs are complementary and not in conflict, one with another. We look to the Gemini to push forward the frontiers in space with space-type maneuvers, the kind you referred to. However, we feel the Dyna-Soar is an extremely important part of the national effort in order to better understand the problems of very high speed maneuver during reentry, large acceleration, large L/R lift-drag ratios. This is important in systems that may involve return from orbit on a prescribed orbit, rather—in the case of Gemini we can wait an extra orbit or two to come down when we want, in the case of the Dyna-Soar we would have the ability to come down without going around the earth several times to get in a favorable position.

Also the Dyna-Soar is giving this country an opportunity to gain additional information on certain very important materials under very high temperature. It would be, we feel, a loss to the country if this program were cancelled.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible, of course, to divorce defense and the peaceful exploration of space. Military au-

thorities have made it very clear that a major breakthrough in space on the part of the Soviets could place the United States in a position of vulnerability which we have not occupied before. We would have a gap.

From the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, it will be clear that from a scientific point of view the Dyna-Soar program is considered important. As to the testimony indicating the position of the military service let me cite Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, U.S. Air Force. In appearing before the Committee of Science and Astronautics on March 1, 1963, in his statement on space posture General Ferguson said:

Military patrol capabilities for the space region could provide oncall protection for U.S. space activities, both scientific and military, in event of hostile enemy actions in the space region. This objective includes: An improved detection and tracking system; a means of inspecting unidentified space devices; and a means of disabling hostile satellites, if this should be required in the national interest.

And lastly, a system for continually monitoring such space phenomena as radiation and solar flares, the latter being essential for prolonged space operations.

These, plus technical building blocks. The Air Force space program also includes elements which form the basic research and development building blocks for a military man in space program. Key elements of this group already in development are: the Titan III launching system, Dyna-Soar, and the Air Force participation in the Gemini program. And in this connection, I think I made it clear that the NASA/DOD agreement of this last month on a joint Gemini program was most certainly welcomed by the Air Force. Another key element we propose is a military test space station. The technologies represented by Gemini, a military test space station, Dyna-Soar, and Titan III are fundamental to any future manned military space capability.

In subsequent questions the testimony of General Ferguson as to the Air Force position on Dyna-Soar is clear.

I will read my own questions from the transcript:

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, while we are on Dyna-Soar could I ask a question?

Mr. KARTH. Yes, sir, Mr. PELLY.

Mr. PELLY. General, in the February 25 issue of Aviation Weekly, on page 26, there is an article that indicates that Dyna-Soar, the whole Dyna-Soar program, is under review and that there is an indication that it will be eliminated or greatly curtailed. Can you comment on that?

General FERGUSON. I have read the article. It is true that we are conducting a survey of the program and we are proposing in the next 2 weeks to present to the Secretary of Defense a detailed examination of Dyna-Soar and its technical objectives.

Mr. PELLY. We had testimony in here when our counsel asked a question the other day from Dr. Robert Seamans, Jr., expressing, I would say, in highest terms the importance of that project. And I think this article in Aviation Weekly indicated maybe the Air Force wasn't willing to stand up and fight.

General FERGUSON. Well, I can assure you the Air Force does, has, and will stand up and fight for Dyna-Soar. We think it is a most critical part of the national space program.

Mark you, I said "national," because Mr. Webb and Mr. Seamans and many other key officials of NASA are on record, recently and over the years, in full support of Dyna-Soar and its technical objectives.

Mr. KARTH. I think what Mr. PELLY had in mind was the ordering of the review by the Defense.

General FERGUSON. Of course this isn't the only system under review. They are all under review, and rightly so, and they continue.

Mr. PELLY. It seems to me the General's statement indicated the importance of the Dyna-Soar, and when it was indicated that the Air Force was not going to stand up and fight, as it were, for this program, I was somewhat concerned in view of the importance that is attached to it by the Assistant Administrator of NASA.

Mr. KARTH. Whatever doubt the gentleman had in his mind as to the Air Force's intentions, obviously have now been cleared up.

Mr. PELLY. I am happy to hear it.

General FERGUSON. I think it is worthwhile to add that we do this with the broadest base of the scientific community, Mr. PELLY. We are, I think, very fortunate to have a very strong scientific advisory board that provides continuing assistance to the Air Force and exercising technical and scientific judgments on the validity of the various programs that we are involved in or that we propose.

I was present at the October review of the Dyna-Soar program by the aeronautics panel of our advisory panel. It is composed of 10 or 12 of the best known aerodynamicists in the country. So that we have plenty of scientific and technical backup to the judgments and positions that we feel we must sustain, particularly with respect to this program.

Mr. KARTH. Thank you, General.

Mr. CHENOWETH.

Mr. CHENOWETH. While on the subject of Dyna-Soar, I wonder, General, if you could give us just briefly the military importance of Dyna-Soar; what is Dyna-Soar, what is the project, why are you so concerned with it?

General FERGUSON. Yes, sir, I would be glad to.

This is another in a series of experimental aircraft that is designed to explore the problems related to lifting body reentry from orbital speeds. It is the logical follow-on to the very, very successful X-15 program that is exploring lower altitudes and lower velocities, but we have already learned, sometime before we fly the first Dyna-Soar, has added greatly to our wealth of knowledge in structures, in materials, high-temperature materials and in structures that are designed to dissipate very high temperatures for long periods of time, and problems related to stability and control.

Now, while very often a research program is pretty hard to define in all its payoffs, here is one that I think, as a follow-on to the X-15, will produce for us and for this Nation some very, very useful information in this particular area. It will apply to many other programs that we have in mind for the future, including the aerospace plane that I mentioned. It could apply to recoverable boosters that we are hoping for at some time in the future. It could apply to other winged vehicles of very high velocities that we are looking for a number of military missions. It could even apply to some commercial products, perhaps a supersonic transport. But all these are hard to define in detail. Yet, based on our previous experience we are certain, we know the information available to us today as a result of ground testing has provided us this information, and certainly, intuitively and based on our experience we can project that much more of real value to the Nation will come from this program.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Where are you with Dyna-Soar right now?

General FERGUSON. Dyna-Soar is in its third year of finding. It will fly—let me see if I have the dates here.

Yes, the first unmanned flights is November of 1965.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Thank you.

Mr. KARTH. Are you finished?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Yes.

Mr. KARTH. General, are you at all familiar with NASA's M-2 concept, of which there was a picture in the newspaper last night, I believe, or at least within the last 24 hours or so? And if so, how does, this in your opinion, compare to Dyna-Soar? Is it duplicative, almost identical?

General FERGUSON. It is in a completely different region of exploration, so far as I know. I believe it is subsonic, relative low speed, isn't it? It is a wooden model for low-speed experimentation. I have only heard of it. I haven't read anything on it.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, the people in Seattle as well as from other parts of the country have become fearful that political influence plays a part in the awarding of Government contracts. I believe that the people in this country want assurance that Government contracts are going to be awarded to contractors strictly on a basis of technical superiority and cost of production.

Surely, during the elections of 1964, my constituents and the voters throughout this Nation will be very much aware of potential political influence in the awarding of Government contracts.

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER].

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, press reports carried yesterday afternoon and this morning indicate that the Secretary of Defense is at long last prepared to "demonstrate that the award of the TFX contract not only was proper but definitely serves the national interest."

As you know this is a matter which is under investigation by a committee in the other body and concerns the awarding of a contract to the General Dynamics Corp., for the development and production of the F-111 fighter-bomber which will be a weapons system utilized by both the Air Force and the Navy.

I can only say that such an explanation by the Secretary on this contract award will be welcomed and is long overdue. It is unfortunate that the Secretary has waited until now to submit his statement when, as he points out, public confidence in the Pentagon has been shaken.

Last month I felt it necessary to take the floor of the House to discuss just how difficult it was for me to get a reply to an inquiry which I made on January 23, 1963, to the Secretary regarding the TFX decision.

This was a matter of extreme importance to the people of my district. Like most defense contract decisions, this had great economic impact upon Wichita and Kansas. If the Boeing Co., which submitted the lowest cost estimate, had been successful the TFX would have been assembled in Wichita.

When the contract was awarded to the Texas concern there were many allegations of political considerations which appeared in the national press and in nationally syndicated columns. My constituents asked me about those

allegations in letters and in my conversations with them back in my district. It was natural, I thought, that I should ask the Office where the final decision on this large contract was made for information so that I could reply responsibly.

On February 26, 1963, I related on the floor of the House how it took a month to get a reply to my inquiry from the Department of Defense and I included in the Record the correspondence which I had from the Department.

The Department of Defense did not answer my inquiry regarding political allegations in the correspondence which I received from the Office of the Secretary on February 22, 1963. However, since my remarks on the floor I have received another communication from David E. McGiffert, Assistant to the Secretary for Legislative Affairs, in which he assured me that insinuations of political influence are completely without foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Secretary of Defense that public confidence in the Pentagon has been shaken. It has not been caused, however, by the investigation by the other body. It has been caused, in part, by the reluctance of the Department of Defense to answer head on the political allegations which have been made since the contract decision was made on November 26, 1962.

Another important factor in this controversy, which should not be overlooked by the Congress, is the fact that, evidently, the company with the lowest cost estimate did not get the contract.

It is most difficult to explain to the taxpayers why a competent firm with a long record of distinguished defense production does not get a contract when it submits costs which are at least \$100 million below those of the contract recipient. At a time when we are striving for economy in Government expenditures and hoping to reduce the taxload of our citizens, the administration and the Congress should be especially accountable to the citizens for such decisions.

Mr. Speaker, defense is Government's biggest and most costly business. It is not bigger than the American people, however, and to earn public confidence our civilian and military leaders in the Defense Department must at all times be ready to fully justify their decisions to the people.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House of Representatives I hope will view this issue of the Dynasoar as something which touches on the national interest and is not a matter of mere local concern. As my colleague from Washington and the gentleman from Kansas so succinctly point out, the policy of cancellation of contracts and political aspects of awarding projects concern every employee of every defense contractor. This has to do with the confidence of each citizen in the Government. The Defense Department has a role in this issue which like Caesar's wife must be beyond suspicion.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain statements and other relevant material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE AMERICAN FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, foreign policy is, of course, associated primarily with problems and situations originating in foreign countries rather than problems of a domestic nature. The American public, therefore, is prone to appraise the success or failure of U.S. foreign policy in terms of our relations with the people of other countries. We know only too well how this relationship can change from hot to warm, to cold, and vice versa.

If such a basis for the formulation and execution of U.S. foreign policy were to be governed by these standards alone, then we would indeed be left naked to the massive assault of communism.

It is because our foreign policy is always based upon the welfare, peace, and security of the American people that it has a year-in-and-year-out continuity. The success of foreign policy must always depend upon the acceptance and support of the American people.

Two articles appearing in the Washington, D.C., Post are indicative of public support of our foreign policy as well as a clear view of the domestic problems which lie ahead in the formulation and execution of the U.S. foreign policy. The first article, entitled "Foreign Aid—Lack of Popular Support Is a Myth," by Roscoe Drummond, published Tuesday, March 12, 1963, and the second article, entitled "Farmer's Shadow Falls Over Europe," by Marquis Childs, published Wednesday, March 13, 1963, are submitted for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

FOREIGN AID—LACK OF POPULAR SUPPORT IS A MYTH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When Congress comes to vote on the foreign aid program, it ought to vote on the basis of fact, not on the basis of fiction.

The greatest fiction of all, to which President Kennedy has unintentionally made his own contribution, is that most American people are against it.

The opposite is the truth.

In his year-end TV interview the President, thinking that he was speaking with ingratiating candor, cited the foreign aid program as crucial despite the "fact" that it is a large burden not popularly supported.

This is not the fact.

The truth is that the foreign aid program is a relatively small burden (one-twentieth of the budget) and is popularly approved.

Here is the evidence.

A study of a whole sequence of findings of the Gallup polls from 1955 to 1963 shows that:

Popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period.

Today 58 percent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid, 30 percent oppose, and 12 percent are neither for nor against it.

There is no great variation between the different sections of the country: in the South 55 percent approve; East, 60 percent; Midwest, 58 percent; Far West, 59 percent.

Public backing of foreign aid is 7 percent higher than it was in 1958, 2 percent higher than in 1955.

In recent years, despite the appropriation of about \$4 billion annually, popular support has not, as widely believed, been declining; voter approval has been going up and voter opposition has been going down.

Most of those who question foreign aid think that the appropriation is much higher than it is.

This, I think, gives a far different picture of American public opinion than the widespread myth that foreign aid is unpopular, even resented, by the great majority of the people.

The nearest thing to a national referendum is this 9-year sequence of Gallup polls. It shows that Mr. Kennedy has been making a mistake by talking about the unpopularity of the program. He should be talking about its popularity.

An examination of the exhaustive back-up statistics and individual responses which lie behind the public reports of the Gallup findings justify these factual conclusions:

The principle of foreign aid is more strongly supported today than in 1958, and at least as strongly as any time since 1955.

The percentage of people opposed to the principle of foreign aid has shown a drop of 3 percentage points since 1958; the number of people with no opinion has dropped 4 percent. This suggests that the principle of foreign aid continues to draw supporters rather than opponents.

Public support for foreign aid is highest among those who know more of the facts about the program. More than 40 percent of the people polled think the foreign aid appropriations represent 10 percent of the national budget instead of 5 percent. More than 80 percent did not know the approximate amount appropriated.

The humanitarian aspects of foreign aid have the greatest appeal to the American people. More than 65 percent of the pro-foreign aid comments of those polled gave the humanitarian reason as the basis of their support.

On the other hand more than 40 percent of those who were critical of the program were not opposed in principle—just felt it was not well administered.

Congress certainly ought to take a hard look on a country-by-country basis to determine for itself how well the program is being administered, and wherein foreign aid is being well or where badly utilized. I am not defending any particular level of appropriation. I am simply reporting that in approving the continuance of foreign aid Congress would be reflecting the judgment of the great majority of the American people.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 13, 1963]

FARMER'S SHADOW FALLS OVER EUROPE

(By Marquis Childs)

While hopefully the controversy within the Atlantic Alliance is still put in terms of a friendly debate, more and more it emerges as a contest of sheer power. A team of specialists has just left for Europe for the first preliminary soundings looking to the round of tariff negotiations due next year. Supposedly this Kennedy round will enable the United States to take full advantage of the liberalized trade act and broaden the current of commerce between the two sides of the Atlantic.

But long before this can happen, decisions may be reached within the European Economic Community that will close the door to any trade expansion. Farm products and farm prices are the great looming obstacle.

If the European farm bloc prevails and prices are fixed at the highest subsidized level of the German producer, with an external tariff wall keeping out American feed grains, the consequences are unforeseeable. The pessimists say it will mean U.S. troops will leave Europe within 2 years or less. And beyond that is the sober shadow of a new isolationism. If President de Gaulle really wants to force the United States out and establish an independent Europe as a third force, agriculture is the surest way to achieve his end.

This was the kind of plain talk Walter Hallstein, head of the Commission of the European Community, heard from Secretary of Agriculture Freeman when he was in Washington last week. Speaking for his client, the American farmer, the Secretary spelled out in the bluntest language the relationship between farm exports and foreign policy.

He used, of course, the now-famous example of the chicken exports that have been cut back within the space of a few months by more than 60 percent. This was done by raising the import duty from 4½ cents a pound to 12½ cents. Thus precipitously American chicken raisers lost \$50 million of a market that they had created through assembly-line techniques of growing and shipping.

The political rub, as Freeman underscored in his private talk with Hallstein, comes from the fact that this market has been developed primarily in Arkansas, Georgia, and several other Southern States. Those States are represented in the Senate by key committee chairmen who exercise extraordinary authority over America's foreign and defense policy. With the South turning against its traditional free trade policy, as a result of the growth of textile and other industry in that region, the blow to the chicken market can have serious repercussions.

But this is nothing as compared to the issue of feed grains that are the bulk of agricultural exports to Europe adding up to \$1 to \$1.5 billion a year. Under the complex system of variable levies agreed to among the six European countries making up the Common Market the commodity price for one must be the price for all. Should this price be set in the next few weeks at the high, subsidized German price, ultimately European tariffs will shut out American grains.

In France, where production costs and prices are much lower, the French farmer will see a bonanza ahead. The estimate here is that 6 million additional acres can be brought into wheat production. That would mean self-sufficiency for Europe and more—an overflow such as has long embarrassed the United States.

The basic fact is that the revolution in agriculture beginning in this country 20 years ago is only getting a start in Europe. The same methods will produce the same revolutionary results we have seen here—mountainous surpluses threatening the price structure and sending the farmer into the political arena to demand his fair share of the national income.

Freeman stressed to Hallstein the importance of getting a quantitative agreement on agricultural products until in the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations a more enduring formula can be achieved. Hallstein expressed the hope that the chicken market can be shared between Europe and the United States, with action taken to undo some of the damage that followed an abrupt tripling of the tariff.

One thing in all this is certain. The revolution in agriculture cannot be halted. European farmers are beginning to copy American assembly-line techniques in chicken raising. Tinkering between country and country or even between bloc and bloc on tariff rates and production quotas will not

suffice. Nothing short of a world food conference facing up to the new revolution and the paradox of surpluses in the face of hunger and want will get close to solving the riddle.

RHODE ISLAND HOSPITAL, PROVIDENCE, R.I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today Rhode Island Hospital at Providence commemorates a century of service to meet the health needs of people in the community, and, in large measure, throughout the State of Rhode Island. It is a privilege for me to pay tribute to the spirit of dedication and the foresight that have shaped the small 70-bed general hospital founded on March 13, 1863, into the imposing medical center of today.

The 70 beds have grown to more than 670, and the services have expanded to include a children's hospital, rehabilitation facilities, care of the chronically ill, clinic services, medical—and especially cancer—research, and education. Thus, the hospital has adjusted to changing needs and kept pace with the progress of medical knowledge and techniques.

Its record of service to the community is an impressive one. Since it opened its doors, 693,520 patients have been cared for in the hospital and over 5 million visits have been made to its several clinics and ambulatory services. Last year alone, 20,620 patients were admitted for bed care and 40,915 received treatment in the emergency department.

Members of the hospital's medical and surgical staff, through research, have made important contributions to the advancement of medical science. In addition, the hospital has supplied postgraduate education and clinical training to 1,100 young physicians, of whom more than 300 are today caring for citizens throughout the State.

The Rhode Island Hospital School of Nursing, founded in 1882, has produced 3,248 well-educated and skilled professional nurses. Graduates of the school are now caring for the sick and injured in all parts of the State. More than 300 young women are now enrolled in the school.

But the past, for all its achievements, is but a forerunner of the future. And plans are in the making for the continuing development of new avenues of service. For example, through arrangements recently made with Brown University, Rhode Island Hospital now has the potential for meeting the needs of a modern, progressive medical school. This capability, together with the completion of facilities still under construction, will broaden the hospital's opportunities to serve the citizens of Rhode Island and to contribute to the advancement of medical science.

On the occasion of its 100th anniversary, therefore, I wish to commend the Rhode Island Hospital for its past accomplishments and to express my confidence in its readiness to meet the challenge of the future.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM AND SUBCOMMITTEES OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday to make certain comments and observations to representatives of the press regarding the proposed work of the House Small Business Committee during the 88th Congress.

Most of the members of the committee were present and participated in this conference, which was attended by representatives of small business organizations as well as the press.

I wanted to announce the membership of the subcommittees as well as the program of the committee and, under unanimous consent, I include my statement and designation of subcommittees at this point in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE L. EVINS, CHAIRMAN, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, PRESS CONFERENCE, MARCH 12, 1963

At the outset, I wish to welcome you gentlemen of the press and thank you for coming to this conference.

During the 88th Congress, I believe you will find that our committee will be accentuating the positive, and by that I mean that we will be seeking to find affirmative methods to help small business in many ways instead of looking primarily for ways to punish big business. I am not opposed to big business as such—I am rather pro small business. Our committee will be working for ways to make sure that all small business concerns are given every chance to succeed and, if possible, to become big business.

It will be one of our objectives to help small business obtain a larger share of Government procurement and defense contracts. Over the years, this committee has been able to be of some helpfulness. During the past year, for instance, the share of Department of Defense prime contract awards given to small business was increased slightly. Regrettably, however, there was a decline in the percentage of both the civilian procurement awards and in the field of research and development. We want to see if this latter situation can be reversed and improved. A greater percentage of research and development contracts must be given to small business.

Another objective of our committee will be to find ways whereby adequate financing assistance can be made available to those small business concerns desiring to modernize their plants, to move to shopping centers, and to otherwise maintain, improve, or increase their competitive capacity, so as to be able to match the tempo of this modern, fast-moving era in which we live today.

It shall be one of the primary goals of our committee to concentrate during this session of Congress on finding ways to assist small business to increase its participation in foreign trade under the new trade expansion program.

Our committee will inquire into the effect which the Common Market is having upon the small businessmen in this country. Last year when Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act, there were dire predictions that many small businesses would fail or go into bankruptcy. As a consequence, the Congress included two provisions in the law. One of these provides for retraining those persons who become unemployed due to imports. The other permits subsidy payments to small business concerns that have been injured by the increased foreign competition.

These new provisions and policies of the trade expansion program are being implemented and have been in operation now for several months. Our committee proposes about 2 weeks from today—that is, on March 25 or 26—to hold the first of a series of hearings relating to various small business problems, including especially the effects of the trade expansion program on small business but embracing as well some of the other small business problems previously mentioned.

I want to advise you gentlemen that at these hearings we propose to hear from officials of the Small Business Administration, the Commerce Department, the Tariff Commission, and the State Department, as well as from representatives of various small business organizations and some of the owners of small business concerns.

Turning to another area, we see that about 650 small business investment companies have now been chartered and licensed. These companies provide a small business investment potential in excess of half a billion dollars, and they are now serving as a new source of equity capital. Our committee will want to examine into the efficiency of these investment companies and their usefulness. We will want to know whether or not they are performing as intended by the Congress.

I note in an article that appeared in a recent issue of the *Harvard Business Review* that under present arrangements a number of these small business investment companies claim that they cannot profitably make small loans or investments—that they must make these investments or loans in large amounts. It is thus possible that there still remains a gap in the financing resources to which small business may turn for help. Further amendments to the Small Business Investment Act may be necessary. Consideration will be given to see whether the act can be amended so as to make it profitable for the small business investment companies to grant more small loans to a greater number of small business concerns instead of a few big loans to a limited number of small business companies.

Our committee will be limited initially to four subcommittees this year; namely, a Subcommittee on Foundations, a Subcommittee on Procurement, a Subcommittee on Taxation, and a Subcommittee on Distribution. As additional small business problems arise, not covered by one of our four subcommittees, it is my plan that these matters will be handled either by the full committee or by designating a special subcommittee to handle the particular problem.

A listing of the subcommittees follows:

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, 88TH CONGRESS

Full committee and subcommittee assignments

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS, chairman of the full committee, and the Honorable WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, ranking minority member of the full committee, are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

Full committee

Small Business Administration and small business in foreign trade—Effect of European Economic Community on small business

Hon. JOE L. EVINS, chairman; Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN; Hon. ABRAHAM MULTER; Hon. TOM STEED; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT; Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI; Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL; Hon. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH; Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.; Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY; Hon. H. ALLEN SMITH; Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON; Hon. RALPH HARVEY.

Subcommittee No. 1

Foundations: Their impact on small business

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman; Hon. JOE L. EVINS; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT; Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY; Hon. RALPH HARVEY.

Subcommittee No. 2

Small business and Government procurement

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, chairman; Hon. TOM STEED; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT; Hon. H. ALLEN SMITH; Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON.

Subcommittee No. 3

Taxation

Hon. TOM STEED, chairman; Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER; Hon. JOHN DINGELL; Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.; Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON.

Subcommittee No. 4

Distribution problems affecting small business

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman; Hon. TOM STEED; Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI; Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.; Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY.

SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HESS & CLARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to a company in my district in Ohio that is celebrating its 70th anniversary of making quality products in its service to American agriculture.

The company I refer to is Hess & Clark, a division of Richardson-Merrell, Inc., and makers of feed medications and animal health products.

Today's modern Hess & Clark plant in Ashland, Ohio, is a far cry from what it was in 1893 when the company came into being.

In those days, production and distribution were strictly a family affair—Gilbert Hess did the compounding and J. L. Clark did the selling. Their wives did the wrapping and packing. Both Hess and Clark were born in the rolling central Ohio farmland that surrounds Ashland.

The firm has shown exceptional growth in the 70 years since the partnership was formed for \$300. Today, scientists at Hess & Clark's multimillion-dollar center are engaged in a wide variety of projects to unlock the secrets of nature, and to study all types of animal and poultry disease problems.

The research does not stop merely at the center, but spreads to dozens of State universities and experiment stations across the country in order that the company's products are tested under actual field conditions. In this manner, Hess & Clark is helping to insure that only the finest meats, eggs, and poultry reach America's dinner tables.

Hess & Clark, under the direction of its president, Dr. A. L. Andrews, is pioneering in the development of an entirely new and different class of drugs, called nitrofurans, derived from furfural, which is made from material in corn cobs and oat hulls.

Nitrofurans first came to attention in the wake of the Normandy invasion in

World War II. Army doctors found that many infected wounds and burns failed to respond to treatment with any of the available antibiotics and sulfa drugs. The medics applied a furan compound, nitrofurazone, directly to the wounds and it provided rapid improvements and facilitated healing. Application for use in agriculture followed the end of World War II.

In all their years of use, scientists report that no significant bacterial resistance to the nitrofurans has developed.

Latest of the nitrofurans to score an important research success is Nidrafur. This drug, recently cleared for use by the Food and Drug Administration, is the result of 5 years of tests to find a multi-purpose medication to combat poultry diseases.

On March 14, 1963, Hess & Clark introduced and explained Nidrafur to the scientists and industry representatives attending the Maryland Nutrition Conference in Washington, D.C.

I salute Hess & Clark for its many achievements and wish continued success to this fine firm in its future endeavors. I ask unanimous consent to include the following comprehensive report on this new drug.

The report follows:

NIDRAFUR, BROAD-SPECTRUM POULTRY FEED ADDITIVE, NOW CLEARED FOR USE

ASHLAND, OHIO.—A new drug application for Nidrafur, Hess & Clark's broad-spectrum nitrofurazone feed additive for poultry, has been cleared for use by the Food and Drug Administration, and a food additive order has been published.

The announcement was made by Dr. A. L. Andrews, president and general manager of Hess & Clark, division of Richardson-Merrell, Inc., makers of feed medications and animal health products.

Nidrafur, which is the trade name for nitrofurazone, has undergone extensive laboratory and field trials conducted by trained researchers over a 5-year period. The results of these tests show that Nidrafur is effective as a medication for broilers and replacement birds in combating several disease problems.

In the presence of air sac infection (CRD complex), Nidrafur reduces mortality and severity of infection, lowers condemnation rate and assists in maintaining weight gains and feed efficiency. Nidrafur also has proved effective for prevention of pullorum disease, fowl typhoid and paratyphoid (salmonellosis); blackhead (histomoniasis); and coccidiosis caused by *E. tenella*, *E. necatrix*, *E. mazima*, and *E. brunetti*.

Nidrafur can be fed to broilers throughout the growing period and to replacements from day-old to 14 weeks of age. Directions call for the use of nitrofurazone at 100 grams per ton to complete ration. This is supplied by 1 pound of Nidrafur premix.

"As is typical with the nitrofurans, nitrofurazone does not build up in body tissues," Dr. Andrews noted, "thus no withdrawal period will be necessary for poultrymen using Nidrafur medicated feed."

SAFETY AND TOXICITY OF NIDRAFUR

Tests of the new drug's safety and toxicity showed Nidrafur is well tolerated at higher than recommended use level.

In long-term toxicity tests scientists found Nidrafur does not adversely affect hatchability and fertility.

EFFECTIVENESS OF NIDRAFUR

1. CRD complex

Current USDA reports show CRD complex (air sac disease) to be the No. 1 cause of broiler condemnations. During 1961 nearly 16 million birds were condemned because of CRD.

Tests were conducted to determine the effect of the continuous feeding of Nidrafur upon the incidence of CRD complex and the condition involving the air sac which results in high dressing plant condemnations. In addition, growth rate and feed conversion were considered in evaluating the effectiveness of this compound.

In a 1,240-bird Georgia trial, birds receiving Nidrafur showed no condemnations due to airsacculitis. This compared with 2.8-percent condemnation for the unmedicated control group and 11.3-percent condemnations for a third group receiving a coccidiostat. Average weight was 3.69 for the Nidrafur group, 3.28 for the controls, and 3.21 for the birds on the coccidiostat. Feed conversion likewise favored Nidrafur—2.39 compared with 2.54 for the controls and 2.58 for the coccidiostat.

Point spread for the Nidrafur group was 130, compared with 74 for the unmedicated controls and 63 for the coccidiostat group.

2. Salmonellosis

In several battery tests, birds 2 and 3 weeks of age were experimentally infected with a broth culture of *S. gallinarum* (fowl typhoid). Half were placed on feed medicated with Nidrafur and half on the same basal ration, unmedicated.

In each of three tests, there were no deaths in the groups receiving Nidrafur. In comparison, deaths in the unmedicated control groups ran 25, 79, and 30 percent.

In several battery tests on *S. pullorum*, birds were inoculated with a broth culture of *S. pullorum* at 1 day of age. Half were immediately placed on Nidrafur medicated feed, and the other half on the same basal ration without medication. These tests, which ran 2 and 3 weeks, again demonstrated the efficacy of Nidrafur by improved weight gains and feed conversion, and reduced mortality. For example, there were 15 deaths in 1 control group of 20 birds infected with *pullorum*, as compared with 3 mortalities in the 20 birds receiving Nidrafur.

In battery tests for *S. typhimurium* (paratyphoid) eggs in the process of hatching were sprayed with a 24-hour-old broth culture of *S. typhimurium*, 1 day before the hatch was completed. Half of the birds were placed on Nidrafur medicated feed, and the other half received the same basal ration without medication. A significant reduction in the mortality rate was noted in those birds fed rations containing Nidrafur.

3. Blackhead

The incidence of blackhead or histomoniasis in broilers and replacement flocks is on the increase according to reports from diagnostic laboratories located where poultry rearing is concentrated. This is especially true of birds from 4 to 6 weeks of age.

Nidrafur has proved highly effective in preventing blackhead infection of chickens.

In tests by Dr. W. Malcolm Reid and associates at the University of Georgia, birds already on Nidrafur medicated feed were artificially infected with blackhead. Two weeks after infection all birds were slaughtered and examined for blackhead lesions.

Birds medicated with Nidrafur had a significantly lower lesion score than did the nonmedicated infected birds. The researchers noted that "since nitrofurazone (Nidrafur) suppresses the heavier infections which result in weight loss, it appears probable that its use in large-scale broiler operations may

result in better weight gains and feed conversion where blackhead disease is present."

They also noted, "if the drug is routinely used as a feed additive it should furnish protection against blackhead disease during the first and second months of age when the bird has the least natural resistance against this disease."

In one New England test, 2-week-old birds were fed Nidrafur for 7 days immediately following infection with blackhead, after which time all birds were slaughtered and examined for blackhead. No birds in the Nidrafur group showed infection. However, 19 out of 20 infected, nonmedicated control birds showed cecal infection and 13 out of the 20 showed liver infection.

4. Coccidiosis

Latest estimates of national losses due to coccidiosis place the figure at \$40 million per year—despite the fact that feeding of a coccidiostat is standard in almost every flock. Nearly three-fourths of the total loss is due to morbidity—one-fourth from mortality.

Extensive field tests showed Nidrafur to be effective in the prevention of coccidiosis caused by *E. tenella*, *E. necatrix*, *E. maxima*, and *E. brunetti*.

Nidrafur successfully reduces mortality, improves gain, and allows development of immunity, which is important in replacements.

Nidrafur has been tested extensively under actual field conditions where its overall effectiveness in preventing these major poultry diseases has been amply demonstrated through better growth, feed conversion, livability and improved point spread. In a Delaware test 16,000 broilers receiving a feed containing a coccidiostat averaged 3.48 pounds with a 2.26 feed conversion and a point spread of 122. This compared with 11,000 birds on Nidrafur averaging 3.95 pounds on 2.37 feed conversion for a point spread of 158. Percent livability was the same for each group.

In another test a group of 18,300 birds on a coccidiostat showed 3.70 pounds weight, 2.37 feed conversion, 94 percent livability, and 133 point spread. The 13,700 birds receiving Nidrafur averaged 3.68 pounds, had a 2.23 feed conversion, a 99-percent livability, and a point spread of 145.

According to Dr. Andrews, the introduction of new Nidrafur represents the latest nitrofurazone advancement by Hess & Clark designed to help poultrymen protect their flocks against many of the most serious diseases. It involves an important new concept in poultry medication—protect the bird, don't just treat the disease. Keep the bird healthy by preventing several diseases at once.

Nitrofurans are a unique class of drugs. Antibiotics, for instance, are properly defined as "chemical substances produced by micro-organisms which inhibit life." Nitrofurans are manmade chemicals, synthesized in the laboratory. They are chemical substances which kill micro-organisms, rather than merely slow them down. They act by interrupting an important step in the utilization of carbohydrates by disease-causing organisms, causing these organisms to literally starve to death.

In their years of use, scientists report that no significant bacterial resistance to the nitrofurans has developed.

RESIDUAL OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, since 1959, I have been fighting the import quotas on

residual oil on the basis of the damaging effect these quotas have on the economy of New England and the eastern seaboard. This has been a long and tedious fight, Mr. Speaker, and as I suggested Monday it is just starting for me. I have not any intentions of letting it ride, so to speak, nor do I quit easily. This is against my nature, and there is no chance of a let-up. I was not impressed with statements by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], Monday, which attempted to becloud the issue. His attacks against the oil industry have nothing to do with the issue at stake. Larger and greater issues than partisanship or harking back to senseless arguments of another era are relevant to this issue. This is by no means a political issue, except insofar as the President has made it one. My colleague will remember, as I have been pointing out recently, that Senator Kennedy—the one now at 1600 Pennsylvania—supported the exact position that I did at that time. He joined with me—I will give my colleague from Ohio a copy of the letter if he wants one—to stop these quotas when the Eisenhower administration put them on. I was a freshman Member of Congress that year, and yet I stood against my own President. Freshmen are supposed to be seen, not heard—yet I had to defend my region in spite of any traditions.

What disturbs me most is the impression that I have been receiving in the last 2 or 3 weeks that the administration is attempting to walk on two sides of the street. Going back a bit, there was some careful wording in the Office of Emergency Planning report calling for a careful and meaningful relaxation of these import quotas. This was taken as a minor victory. The next encouraging sign was the visit of President Betancourt, of Venezuela, to this country. At that time I wired the President and asked him to dramatically lift these restrictions and help aid the sagging economy of Venezuela which exports 90 percent of crude and residual to this country. I was gratified a day later when I read the text of the joint communique between the two Presidents. Several specific points were made in this release.

The two Presidents reviewed the oil situation and recognized that "the United States has been Venezuela's largest market" and stated that were both confident that it would "continue to be on an expanding scale." They concluded that "Venezuela's position in the U.S. petroleum market is therefore a matter of continuing concern" to both Governments and that this position would be "recognized in the administration of the U.S. oil export program." The two leaders also agreed that there should be periodic exchanges of information and views at a technical level with the goal of "reaching better trade agreements" between the two countries and that they would "review in advance such substantive changes in the oil import program as the United States may contemplate in the future."

These were very definite signs of agreement, Mr. Speaker, and at the time I was convinced that the April 1st deadline for the Department of Interior report would end the restrictions.

Just a few days ago, however, the President met with Mine Workers President Boyle and "assured him" that the OEP recommendations "would not be made effective" until or unless further discussions were held with mine workers. I was, understandably, outraged by these reports and checked all over the city for confirmation. Mr. Boyle told my office that he had been quoted "exactly" and White House press officials refused to either confirm or deny the substance of the President's statements to Boyle.

All of this seemed a recapitulation to the coal magnets in this country.

I am not suggesting that the President is dutybound to his stand as a U.S. Senator, and I realize that he made a number of promises in 1960 to the various coal-producing States. I am simply asking for a pertinent review of the facts involved, and that he take into consideration the fact that condition of the New England economy is critical, and it is losing \$30 million a year because these quotas prevent most of our hospitals, large apartment homes, schools, and industries from using the practical and inexpensive oil for heating.

What my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] said Monday has no bearing on the issue. In fact, I am surprised that he would inject such extraneous matters into the discussion. For example, I have never talked about the outflow of gold, as he suggests I will. I refuse to make this an issue between oil and coal; in fact, there is an unholy alliance between the domestic oil producers and the coal barons. I do not know who would benefit from the lifted restrictions except the elderly patients in the New England seaboard hospitals, the children in the schools, and our poorer residents who cannot afford the expensive coal.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that he review the facts of the matter and then join the fight if he is so inclined. Surprisingly, I have heard little from him on this issue until yesterday. In passing, I might say that my homework on this subject has been intense for the last 5 years and that I would be happy to provide any background information that the gentleman desires. I must say that I am very sympathetic with the plight of the coal miners that he describes, and at the same time have figures showing that coal production was considerably up in 1962.

In fact, I would hope that a number of gentlemen in this House would begin seriously reviewing this issue. Thank you.

DECISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND TO FINANCE AGRICULTURAL PROJECT IN RED CUBA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, another highly responsible voice has been raised in the United States in protest against the recent incredible decision of the United Nations Special Fund to finance an agricultural development project in Red Cuba.

A news release under date of February 18, by Hon. Byron B. Gentry, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, urges that this action be immediately repudiated by the American people and responsible Government officials.

I welcome this pronouncement by the head of this great organization of 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans—a pronouncement which curtly and properly rejects the sophistry of arguments that the United States, as a member of the U.N., is not thereby directly aiding a Sino-Soviet dominated Communist regime in Cuba, dedicated to the takeover of the Western Hemisphere and the conquest of the United States.

Commander Gentry has exceptional credentials when it comes to calling the shots regarding the Cuban situation.

In a press release last September 28, Commander Gentry called for an immediate naval blockade of Cuba—nearly a month before President Kennedy took this unfortunately short-lived action.

In this September 28 statement, which condemned the proposed Soviet "fishing port" as "outrageous," Commander Gentry offered the singularly prophetic warning that if the administration took no action, "the situation will be much worse next month than it is now."

In view of some recent objections by top administration officials to congressional and public criticism of national policies regarding Cuba—the latest by Vice President JOHNSON—I suggest that Commander Gentry's current protest on U.N. aid to Red Cuba can scarcely be characterized as either "irresponsible" or "partisan."

I commend his February 18 statement to the Congress and the American people:

The United Nations proposal to proceed with support of Communist agricultural programs in Cuba is a deliberate affront to the principles of freedom and justice, which motivated its founding. It is highly improper and embarrassing for our Nation to continue supporting a U.N. agency that is giving assistance to a Red dictator, whose purpose is the destruction of our Nation and freedom throughout the Americas.

What this really means is that the United Nations is embarking on a program to strengthen the bloody and oppressive Communist government of Cuba, thus strengthening a regime that is kept in power by the Russian expeditionary force in Cuba.

The VFW is not persuaded by technical explanations that U.S. financial support will not be involved in helping Castro. Regardless of such assurances, the fact remains that the U.S. taxpayers are the major contributor to the kind of endeavor the U.N. is now undertaking in Red Cuba. Directly or indirectly, it will be the U.S. taxpayers who will be footing a major portion of the bill for supporting communism in Cuba under this U.N. project.

It is truly shocking that the U.N., supposedly dedicated to the protection of free-

dom, is actively supporting an aggressive Red regime, virtually on the doorstep of the United States. The VFW urges that the U.S. Government take every possible step to prevent the United Nations from bolstering Castro and his Communist control of Cuba.

Using U.N. funds and prestige to strengthen Castro's cruel Communist government places the U.N. in a position of deliberately aiding an avowed enemy of the United States. It is this kind of action which creates grave doubts as to the wisdom of continued U.S. membership in the U.N.

U.S. TREASURY ACQUISITION OF HARD FOREIGN CURRENCY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an item from the Washington Post & Times Herald concerning "U.S. Treasury Acquisition of Hard Foreign Currency." This story alleged that the U.S. Treasury was trying to float short-term bonds to the French Government for the equivalent of \$100 to \$150 million.

The Wall Street Journal of March 12, 1963, carried a disturbing editorial about our balance of payments situation entitled "Ignorance or Intent?" Because the strength of the U.S. dollar is important not only to Americans but to the entire free world, I commend this editorial to my colleagues. It says:

IGNORANCE OR INTENT?

Is it possible the Government's officials really do not understand the balance-of-payments problem?

The question is asked in all seriousness, for there are few economic matters more serious than this continuing deficit. The yawning gap was \$2.2 billion last year, almost as huge as the year before, and the consequent gold outflow was nearly \$900 million, bringing America's gold stock to its lowest level in about a quarter of a century.

All hope has been abandoned of ending the drain by the end of this year, as the administration had been promising. On the contrary, Treasury Secretary Dillon now warns of more gold losses and a continuing payments deficit. In a word, we are further than ever from halting this major source of nonconfidence in the dollar, this leakage which at the whim of foreigners could turn into a calamitous flood.

And what, pray, is the Government doing about it?

For one thing, Mr. Dillon says tax reduction plus persistent and firm expenditure control will bring improvement in the balance of payments. His thought on taxes appears to be that rate reductions will spur domestic investment and thus keep more capital at home. To that pious hope, about all that can be said now is, we'll see.

The comment about expenditure control was perhaps a joke. It is hard to see how anyone could talk like that with a straight face in view of a Federal spending budget wildly out of control and a budget deficit deliberately planned to hit nearly \$12 billion.

Meantime the Government continues its piddling efforts to stanch the flow: Requiring foreign-aid money to be spent here, discouraging American tourist spending abroad and the like. The continuing payments-

gold crisis is sufficient testimony to the inadequacy of these measures.

Now the officials are considering a further gimmick which they think will finally turn the tide. This would be a deliberate boost in short-term interest rates to make them more attractive in relation to foreign rates; the short-term capital outgo is one of the administration's preferred whipping-boys for the payments trouble.

A general move away from the prevailing easy-money policy would be a healthy development of itself, and even this limited tinkering might indeed stop some of the short-term capital movements. But the thinking behind the plan seems peculiar.

The technique being discussed for boosting the rates is to have the Federal Reserve raise the discount rate from 3 percent to possibly 3.5 percent, as though that would automatically increase interest rates, and short-term ones in particular. Unaccompanied by other steps, it might or it might not; in the past such changes have usually followed or accompanied market rises rather than specifically causing them.

As a part of this move, the United States would pressure Canada (hasn't the Government caused enough trouble there recently?) to lower its discount rate of 4 percent, in the hope of curbing the flow of short-term U.S. investment funds in that direction. This seems somewhat wishful; a spread between 3.5 and 4 percent is hardly great enough to matter much one way or another.

In any case, this whole device, like all the others now in operation, is a good deal less than a frontal attack on the payments problem. Short-term capital is not the main cause of the deficit; in fact, the return on foreign investment about equals the investment outgo.

The main cause is the Government's own excessive spending at home and abroad and its generally loose fiscal and monetary policies. It is as plain as can be that if the Government would ever get its financial house in order, the payments deficit and the dangerous gold drain could be made to disappear in quick time.

If the Government does understand these simple facts, its refusal to take the required action is not easily explained. Whether the trouble is ignorance or intent, it is inexcusable behavior on the part of the guardians of the people's money.

SPORTS ANTIBRIBERY LEGISLATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would make it a Federal offense to conspire, in interstate or foreign commerce, to influence by bribery the outcome of any sporting contest. It is identical to the bills introduced in the Senate by Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, and in the House by Representative WILLIAM McCULLOCH, of Ohio, ranking minority member of the House Judiciary Committee. The bill would apply the penalties of up to \$5,000 and/or 10 years in prison to all who may be involved in such schemes. This would include players and officials, as well as gamblers and fixers. Although the Federal Government is granted authority over this subject matter, there is nothing

in this bill that would in any way exclude or circumscribe the effect of any local law or the jurisdiction of any local authority over an offense over which it would have jurisdiction in the absence of this legislation.

Today, young American athletes are being subjected to steadily mounting pressures from gambling syndicates to "fix" games, "shave" points, and to turn competitive sports over to the patrons of organized crime. Although this is far from a new development on the American scene, it has increased markedly in recent years and threatens to totally undermine public confidence in all competitive sports.

There is no question but that the organized gambling and bookmaking syndicates are countrywide in the nature and scope of their activities. Further, there is no question but that the Federal Government has full jurisdictional power to act on statutory authority to assert its full strength against this outrageous condition. Enactment of this proposed legislation won't solve the problem, but it will provide our Federal law-enforcement officers with the legal machinery they have long needed to investigate and prosecute these unlawful activities. The leading athletic associations are solidly behind this legislation. They have long urged that action be taken to enact this proposal to improve the climate of athletic participation in the United States. I hope that the 88th Congress gives prompt and favorable consideration to this important legislation.

THE CREATION OF AN ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, having represented San Diego for more than 10 years, I am very much aware of the critical need for the creation of an additional judicial district. Such a requirement is essential to the proper and orderly processes of justice that, unfortunately, are suffering in our area today.

Accordingly, I have introduced the following bill today along with Congressman JAMES B. UTT, 35th Congressional District, and Congressman PAT MARTIN, 38th Congressional District, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Our bills provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California. The services that can be provided by the approval of this legislation are most critically needed this year. Our county alone has had an estimated increase of over 134,689 people since 1960. The Federal community

of the proposed judicial district, which incorporates the full length of the California-Mexico border as well as the international port of San Diego, has had an equal rise in activity involving the Federal Government. More people are crossing the border, more trade is conducted across the border, and more tonnage and passengers are passing through our port facilities.

The unprecedented growth of San Diego and Imperial Counties continues at a rate which I am sure during the present decade will equal or surpass the record of the decade of 1950-60 when our growth rate was 86 percent.

Federal litigation in our area continues to increase; San Diego today handles nearly as much Federal criminal court business as Los Angeles, and this discounts immigration cases, which as you know are most time consuming and are of a large quantity, particularly in our district.

The 25th custom collection district has the same borders as the proposed judicial district and is the largest narcotic and border egress and ingress district in the country.

Many of the services of a new judicial district are already being provided in San Diego so that the costs of implementing this legislation are at an estimated \$46,750 per year. The San Diego County Bar Association has made a careful analysis of the additional salary and expense requirements, and they find that this figure would be more than made up through per diem, travel, telephone, and duplicate filing and other administrative costs that are today required because the district offices are located in Los Angeles, some 120 miles away.

This figure, of course, does not represent any of the actual savings that will result to the litigants themselves and their attorneys, which as you can imagine can be extensive when a 120-mile commute is involved.

Our area needs a new judicial district and needs it today. I urge favorable action on this legislation, which provides that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California.

COMMISSION TO REVIEW FEDERAL LAWS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. ST. ONGE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for the creation of a commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government.

The Hatch Political Activities Act was enacted by Congress—Public Law 252 of the 76th Congress—back in 1939. Since then a period of 24 years has elapsed.

It was originally designed to remove employees in the Federal service and those in Government-financed State-Federal programs from the political arena. Its primary aim was to protect public employees from various pressures exerted upon them to engage in involuntary political activity.

In the 1930's our country was still struggling with the great depression and its aftereffects. One of the major causes leading to the adoption of the Hatch Act at the time was that, because of the desperate economic situation, many citizens had to accept employment with the Works Progress Administration and similar projects. It was felt by Congress then that the dependence of large numbers of individuals upon Federal funds for their income—inadequate as this income was—could be used as an unethical political tool to force their allegiance or support to one particular political party.

Nearly a quarter of a century has passed since enactment of the original Hatch Act. Administrations of both major political parties of the Nation have held the reins of power. We have suffered the anguish of World War II and the Korean war. We have experienced considerable economic and social upheaval. Even political thinking in our country has not been at a standstill; there has been much change and a greater public awakening to political problems.

Over the years, there have been those who advocated complete repeal of the Hatch Act. There are some who advocate that the law should be revised to allow a limited degree of political activity in the governmental structure. Others believe the act should be amended in a way to reflect the changes in our political attitudes of the times, but they are not certain how this can be achieved without endangering the merit principle upon which the whole civil service system is based.

True, there have been several amendments of a liberalizing nature since the law was enacted, but they were of minor importance and none of them has come to grips with the basic problem, namely, the participation or denial to millions of public employees of the right to share in the political activity of the Nation. The question still remains: What should be the status of Federal and other public employees in the political life of our country nearly a quarter of a century after passage of the Hatch Act? In line with that question it may also be asked whether any basic changes have occurred in our thinking which would warrant a completely new look at the problem?

The effect of the Hatch Act has been interpreted in some quarters as nothing less than the equivalent of disenfranchisement. The public employee exercises the privilege of casting his ballot and thus participating in the democratic process, but not much else. He cannot participate in political activity. He cannot be a candidate for office, not even for member of a board of education. He cannot even be an officer of any political organization. He cannot solicit support or financial aid for any candidate, or even solicit people to become candidates

for public office. He cannot distribute campaign material, march in a political parade, sell tickets for a political dinner, or publish a letter or article in behalf of any political party or candidate.

At the same time, it is reasonable to expect that complete elimination of the Hatch Act could seriously damage the Federal civil service system which would once again fall prey to the spoils system. We want to retain the civil service system and improve upon it, but we also would like to make it possible for public employees to have greater opportunity to be more active politically without fear of loss of their Government jobs. At the present time, with the denial of all the activities enumerated above, public employees are treated as second-class citizens. This prompted a postal worker to urge recently that a campaign be undertaken "to restore civil rights to Federal workers."

I do not believe that it was the intention of Congress to relegate public employees to a position of second-class citizenship when the law was enacted 24 years ago. Nor do I believe that the practice of political privileges granted to all U.S. citizens can be denied under our Constitution to a large segment of our population simply because they are Government employees. In our free society, political freedom, political self-respect, and the freedom of expression are cherished possessions.

For these reasons, I believe that the Hatch Act has become outdated in our time and has proved to be harmful to millions of our citizens whom it deprives from exercising certain rights guaranteed them in the Constitution. A reappraisal of national policy regarding political activities of Government employees is definitely needed. I think it is high time to make such a reevaluation of the law and its applicability today in the light of changing events.

This is the purpose of the bill I am introducing today. It calls for the establishment of a bipartisan commission to review the Federal laws limiting political activity by Government employees. It is to be known as the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel and is to consist of 12 members. The members of the Commission are to be appointed as follows:

First. Four by the President, two from the executive branch of the Government, and two from private life.

Second. Four by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from private life.

Third. Four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House, and two from private life.

The duties of the Commission, as defined in my bill, shall be to make a full and complete investigation and study of the Federal laws which limit or discourage the participation of Federal and State officers and employees in political activity with a view to determining the effect of such laws, the need for their revision or elimination, and an appraisal of the extent to which undesirable results might accrue from their repeal.

The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report, including its findings and recommendations, to the President

and to Congress within 1 year after enactment of my bill and the Commission shall then cease to exist. In the fulfillment of the provisions of the act, the Commission shall be empowered to conduct hearings and issue subpoenas.

In view of the fact that the life of the Commission is to extend only over the period of 1 year, I do not visualize any considerable expenditure. In fact, in order to keep all expenditures at a minimum, it is prescribed in the bill that members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or Government officials shall serve without compensation, while those from private life shall serve on a per diem basis of \$50. The Commission shall have the authority to appoint such personnel as it deems advisable, but it is suggested in the bill that the services of Government agencies which can be helpful in the study may be requested by the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for a broad and impartial review of this very important but vexing problem. As now constituted and applied, the Hatch Act is outmoded, unjust, and unfair toward millions of our citizens who are loyal public servants, well educated and civic-minded persons. In the long run our country will be the loser and our democratic process will suffer if we continue to deny them the basic rights to which they are entitled. Government service should be a badge of honor and public trust, not a status of second-class citizenship.

MINE SAFETY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a mine safety bill which will provide for Federal inspection of every underground coal mine in the United States. The amendment to Public Law 552, as contained in my bill, would benefit every coal miner and every coal operator in this country.

I am interested in mine safety and have seen what the passage of a Federal law for the inspection of mines can do. An industry which formerly numbered its fatalities in the thousands has reduced its death rate to less than 300. In 1962, 289 miners died, a far cry from what the death rate was once but still far too many.

The death and accident rate in the coal mines in America must be reduced further and I feel that one way to do it is to give Federal inspectors the right to close down any coal mine, large or small, when they find that danger of a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundations, man-trap or man-hoist accident exists.

Under the present Federal mine safety law, workers in No. 2 mines, those that employ 15 or more men, are well protected. That same protection should be extended to the workers in No. 1 mines, those employing less than 15 men.

There is no valid reason for giving Federal inspectors the right to close down a mine containing 15 or more employees when they find an eminent danger existing and refusing the same power to the same inspectors when, after inspection, they find an eminent danger existing in a mine that employs less than 15 men. There is no logic or excuse for such a distinction. I note for the record that in 1960, No. 1 mines had over 30 percent of the fatalities while producing 14 percent of our coal and in 1961 No. 1 mines had 34 percent of the fatalities in the coal industry while producing only 12 percent of our coal.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT SO AS TO PROVIDE FURTHER FOR THE PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS IN COAL MINES

Be it enacted in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That Public Law 552, Eighty-second Congress, entitled "An Act to Amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines," approved July 16, 1952 (ch. 877, 66 Stat. 692, 30 U.S.C. 471) be amended by striking out section 201(b) thereof.

RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION IN SCHOOLS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, last June, when the Supreme Court handed down its regrettable decision that the Constitution of the United States was placed in peril because a group of New York children voluntarily recited a 22-word nondenominational prayer, it seemed to me that the canons and criteria of validity in thought had dipped to a nadir never before reached in this land where freedom once found its most impregnable home.

Another year has almost passed and there is now every indication that this same Court is about to plumb new depths in their zeal to probe minutiae never envisioned by the framers of the Constitution.

To bolster their findings, the Justices perch upon pedicels of logic too slim to support even a whit of their proclamings.

How, I now wonder, are we ever to answer the tidal wave of inquiries we will receive when the Court rules that the Lord's Prayer and the Bible are banned from our schools?

What can we tell our own children as to why we have done nothing to stop the Court from this pristine heresy?

Will it be sufficient for us to say, "The Court did it. We are blameless?" I, for one, do not believe we can evade the issue in that way.

Columnist William S. White has written brilliantly of the untenable position we are inexorably being pushed into by the Court.

I commend his editorial from the March 1 edition of the Washington Evening Star to each and every Member and I echo his plaintive inquiry: "Are beauty and gentleness and tenderness to be declared unconstitutional?"

Finally, I add my own query: "What are we here in the House going to do to stop what appears now to be an inevitable 'finding' of this Court?"

RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION IN SCHOOLS—FREE EXERCISE OF BELIEF IS CONSIDERED THE TRUE ISSUE IN ARGUMENT

(By William S. White)

Another spring is to bring another bitter division within the Supreme Court—and within the United States—determining whether any chemical trace of religious feeling, however voluntary and nonsectarian, is to be allowed expression in the public schools of the United States.

The Court last June forbade as unconstitutional the voluntary recitation in New York schools of a 22-word nondenominational prayer prepared by the school authorities. Now it is to decide two other questions:

Will constitutional government be threatened if such of the children of Baltimore as may care to do so continue to open each school day with Bible reading and by repeating aloud the Lord's Prayer?

Will constitutional government be threatened if such of the children of Pennsylvania as may care to do so continue to open each school day by hearing a reading of 10 paragraphs from the Bible?

Sessions of the Supreme Court itself are opened with an invocation of God's blessing upon its work. Public officials, including the President, traditionally take oath upon the Bible. The national anthem—the one anthem of every man, woman, and child, whatever his religion or the lack of it—still recognizes the existence of God.

All this notwithstanding, however, the outlook is not too good for those schoolchildren who wish to participate in ceremonies acknowledging that divine mercy and divine justice still exist in an America of increasing materialism and private hopelessness.

For the arguments recently heard before the Justices on the Baltimore and Pennsylvania cases—which probably will be settled along in June—have strongly indicated that some at least intend to read the doctrine of "separation of church and state" in such a way as to permit God to be mentioned in the schoolhouses hereafter only under one's breath.

The first amendment to the Constitution declares, as to religion: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This is where the doctrine of separation arose. But surely the true issue here is not that someone is trying to make an "establishment of religion"—namely, to set up one state church superior to all others.

Surely the true issue involved here is involved in the latter half of that amendment, that forbidding interference with the free exercise of religion.

Any minority, including the ultimate minority of one pupil, has the undoubted right to refuse to participate in any religious exercise. This columnist, for one, would support such a right to the end. But does a minority have the right to forbid the majority such an exercise, if this be their faith and choice, on the extraordinary argument that if the majority do choose to pray, this somehow invades the rights of the minority? If so, what becomes of the second half of the first amendment?

If schoolchildren violate the Constitution by voluntary prayer acknowledging a Divine Being, what of singing the Star-Spangled Banner in school, having in mind its explicit acknowledgment that "In God we trust"?

Is respect for tradition itself to be declared unlawful, on the ground that some people reject tradition? If one child chooses to pray, does he really make "an establishment of religion"? How in God's name—if the expression may be pardoned—does he harm the child who does not wish to pray? Even if, as atheists claim in immeasurable sadness, faith is only a legend, is it in any way ugly? Are beauty and gentleness and tenderness also to be declared unconstitutional?

IMPACT OF CUBAN REFUGEES CAUSES PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to alleviate the conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment that exist and have existed in the district which I represent. Such conditions exist not only because of the usual reasons for unemployment but also because of the unusual economic distress and unemployment caused by the impact of approximately 150,000 refugees residing in this area who have fled the tyranny and oppression of the Communist government of Cuba. My bill will bring jobs and economic assistance to American citizens who, because of this unusual condition, find themselves unemployed and otherwise economically distressed.

Mr. Speaker, since the Castro Communist government of Cuba has enslaved the people of that unhappy country, approximately 200,000 persons have escaped the tyranny and oppression existing there and sought refuge in the United States.

The bulk of these people are in the Miami area. Despite the generous assistance of the Catholic church and others, our local citizens, individually, local governments and many voluntary agencies—it soon became obvious that the needs of these refugees could not be met solely out of local resources, no matter how willing the local citizens nor how desirable such a solution might be. I thereupon immediately urged recognition of the existence of the Cuban refugees and the problems caused thereby as being the primary responsibility of the Federal Government.

Two administrations and the Congress of the United States have generously responded to my requests to assist the people of the district which I represent in dealing with the problems, economic and otherwise, created by the Cuban refugees.

Today I must again ask my colleagues and advise the Nation that the people of Florida's Fourth District are in need of additional assistance as a result of approximately 150,000 Cuban refugees still residing in our midst. This has caused tremendous economic pressure since the refugees, very naturally, have tried to

obtain and have been successful in obtaining employment. Much of this employment has been at reduced wages, tending to depress the labor market. Every refugee so employed has displaced an American normally employed so that in addition to many thousands of refugees who are unemployed, there are many thousands of Americans also unemployed.

The U.S. Department of Labor had long ago determined that there were a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens so as to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area. However, we have not been certified for assistance under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act specifically adopted by this body to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically distressed areas.

Mr. Speaker, since the fall of 1962 I have repeatedly requested the Department of Labor to certify that the unemployment condition in the district which I represent is sufficient to qualify the area under the Redevelopment Act. This has not yet been accomplished for a variety of reasons. Whatever the reason, the point is that we have not yet been so certified so as to be eligible for the employment and economic benefits which would be available to us under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The economic situation in Dade County is distressing. Total unemployment, both American and Cuban, is fantastically high. Citizens and refugees are in open competition for a limited number of jobs. Wages have tended to become depressed. Feelings are running high. The laboring classes, and particularly the Negro, have felt the brunt of this distress.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of the United States is one of long standing and great tradition—down through history we are known as a sure haven from persecution and the upholders of individual rights and freedom. But it is this very foreign policy, in action, which has permitted these refugees—mothers, fathers, wives, and children—to escape tyranny, fear, and death and to seek refuge and security in the United States.

I have no quarrel with this policy nor does the overwhelming majority of the people in the district which I represent. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the American citizens who are directly affected as a result of this policy, and who are the citizens of the district I represent, are entitled to consideration in obtaining whatever Federal assistance can be made available.

Today's problem, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is to obtain additional unemployment and economic benefits for the American citizens in Florida's Fourth District, which I represent, who are without jobs and who are otherwise economically distressed. My bill, Mr. Speaker, would seek to provide employment opportunities by making the area which I represent eligible for benefits under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, do not imply that no assistance has been rendered to the citizens of the district which I rep-

resent. I strongly supported this administration's program, now known as Public Law 87-658, the Public Works Acceleration Act. Because of the unemployment situation, the district which I represent has been certified as eligible to receive assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act. Under this act we have thus far obtained several million dollars in approved programs. Under this act, which requires local participation, the district which I represent will secure approximately 5,600 additional man-months or 980,700 man-hours of employment. As long as the unemployment and economic distress exists in the district which I represent, we shall continue to request assistance and urge favorable consideration for approved projects under this very worthy program.

However, Mr. Speaker, the economic distress and unemployment in the Miami area arises not only from the usual sources, but also because of the tremendous number of refugees who are residing therein. Whether the refugee is employed or unemployed, his presence contributes directly to the economic distress and high unemployment of American citizens. It is this factor which my bill deals with. It is because of the persistence of these unusual factors that I have sought relief under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act.

I have also long sought relief under this law by administrative determination under existing criteria. Since the middle of last year, I have requested and urged repeatedly that in the criteria determination for Area Redevelopment Act eligibility, all unemployed shall be considered regardless of whether they are Americans or refugees. While the Department has had this matter before it all these many months, it has not yet been resolved.

I have urged today that immediate action be taken on this problem by the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor; and Commerce. I have directed the following letters to them, respectively:

MARCH 13, 1963.

HON. ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I respectfully request and urge you to certify forthwith to the Secretary of Labor and to the Secretary of Commerce the number of Cuban refugees who are residing in Dade County, Fla. Such certifications should be based on the number of Cuban refugees who have been registered through the Cuban Refugee Center, less the number of Cuban refugees who have been certified by you as having been relocated out of the Dade County area.

I would appreciate also if you would forward your estimate as to the number of Cuban refugees who are residing in the Dade County area who have not been registered through the Cuban Refugee Center.

This urgent request is made because of the obvious economic impact which the residence of the Cuban refugees has created, specifically in unemployment.

I am of the opinion that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce, based on the certification, have the authority and discretion to immediately certify that this area qualifies under the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87-27. Thus,

qualifying under the act, the people of Dade County would be eligible for consideration to receive assistance in alleviating this problem of substantial and persistent unemployment.

I respectfully urge your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 13, 1963.

HON. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You are fully aware of the problem of unemployment in my area. I have been urging you since September of 1962 to furnish to the Secretary of Commerce the findings and statistical data required by law in order to make Dade County, Fla., eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act, and thus bringing relief in the way of jobs to the people of Dade County.

I am aware of the fact that you have been seeking to obtain statistical data with the cooperation of State agencies. All of this may be well and proper and in time you may accumulate the necessary statistics and data.

However, Mr. Secretary, I respectfully point out that many months have gone by; the unemployment situation in Dade County has worsened. The area has been classified as class D labor surplus market area, with a current rate of unemployment of 6.1 percent. This did not consider at all the unemployed Cuban refugee and I have consistently urged and requested that the Cuban refugee should be considered in the compilation of statistics and that when this is done, Dade County would be clearly eligible for the benefits under the Area Redevelopment Act.

I respectfully urge you, therefore, to certify forthwith to the Secretary of Commerce the finding that this area qualifies under the Area Redevelopment Act. It is my conviction that in view of the obvious facts of the aggravated unemployment situation in the Fourth District, caused by the impact of the Cuban refugees, without regard to whether the Cuban refugee is employed or unemployed, Dade County should qualify under the act.

You have the discretion to make that determination. I respectfully urge you to make that determination forthwith and to so certify to the Secretary of Commerce. I shall appreciate your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 13, 1963.

HON. LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I know that you are fully aware of the severe condition of unemployment which exists in Dade County, Fla. The Miami standard metropolitan area, embracing all and only Dade County, Fla., has had substantial unemployment for 5 years. The unemployment rate presently stands at 6.1 percent. The area has been classified as class D labor surplus market.

This determination, however, has not included unemployed Cuban refugees. The existence of the employed Cuban refugee as well as the unemployed Cuban refugee has seriously aggravated the unemployment condition in the Fourth District, which I represent. The rate of unemployment is probably closer to 13 percent. Certainly it is obvious that this is an intolerable situation for our citizens.

We have received substantial assistance under existing programs, such as the Public Works Acceleration Act. However, we have

not been declared qualified under the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87-27.

In performance of your functions authorized by Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act specifically enacted by the Congress to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment, I respectfully request you to determine forthwith, pursuant to the authority of that law, that the Miami standard metropolitan area is eligible immediately for area redevelopment assistance.

I see no reason why this determination cannot be made forthwith. Standard labor statistics pursuant to law are available for certification to you; in addition, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Department of Labor can certify immediately the number of Cuban refugees who are residing in the area. Whether the Cuban refugee is employed or unemployed is immaterial from an administrative standpoint in the determination of the question of substantial unemployment. Be that as it may, the certification of the number of Cuban refugees can be made forthwith to you by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and I have today called upon the Secretary to make such certification to you forthwith.

The Secretary of Labor can certify to you the total number of unemployed in this area and I have urged him today to certify this fact to you forthwith.

Mr. Secretary, I would not take this unprecedented action in urging this immediate request if I had not previously exhausted all administrative possibilities.

Recent events in the district which I represent point up the seriousness of the unemployment situation, particularly as it is aggravated by the impact of the Cuban refugees. Accordingly, I respectfully urge your immediate determination that Dade County, Fla., is eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act so that our unemployed workers will have the opportunity to obtain the employment which they seek.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion, as I have been since the passage of this act, that the area which I represent should be eligible under the terms, the spirit, and the intent of the Area Redevelopment Act, which was specifically adopted by the Congress to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

Legislation which I today introduce goes one step further than the administrative action which I have been calling for, for so long. Congress has heretofore, at my request, recognized the problem of the Cuban refugees as one for national concern. This House, and I am grateful to each one of my colleagues, and this Congress have approved the authorizations and the appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare and other costs for the care of the Cuban refugees. Without this program, the whole cost would fall on local resources which are already strained to the limit. I am now, today, again calling, urging, and requesting the sympathetic and favorable consideration of my colleagues in this legislative body to continue their recognition of the impact and economic distress caused by the residence of approximately 150,000 refugees in the district which I represent, and the adjoining one, as still of national concern.

I call the problem again to the attention of this House because the problem has not yet been completely resolved. Severe unemployment still exists—almost 13 percent. There is considerable economic distress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my bill would provide an additional criteria for eligibility under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act. This additional criteria would provide benefits to those areas wherein 50,000 or more Cuban refugees have resided for 1 of the 2 preceding calendar years. Such a fact would be certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who administers the Cuban refugee program, to the Secretary of Commerce, who administers the area redevelopment program. Under the bill we would also retain the criteria that the Secretary of Labor must determine and certify to the Secretary of Commerce that a condition of substantial unemployment has existed for the last 9 of the preceding 12 calendar months, which is a requirement now carried in the present public works acceleration law.

The exact language of the bill is as follows:

A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2504) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall also designate as 'redevelopment areas' those areas within the United States where the Secretary of Labor determines that a condition of substantial unemployment has existed for at least nine of the preceding twelve calendar months, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies to the Secretary that the number of Cuban refugees residing in such areas has equalled 50,000 or more for one of the two preceding calendar years."

Mr. Speaker, for many years now the people of the district which I represent have willingly, courageously, and generously borne the brunt of the problems brought about by the approximately 150,000 non-American refugees living and working with us. We have been and are proud of the part which we have been called upon to play in the long-standing humane concepts of a free society, indicating to the refugees and to the world, proof of its concern for the dignity and the worth of an individual. This principle, among others, separates us clearly from the Communists or any other system which seeks to enslave mankind, and holds individual worth and dignity as secondary or even unnecessary. But, Mr. Speaker, in doing all this, we must also take every step to see to it that our own citizens receive assistance from our Government, particularly and especially when such assistance is within the spirit and intent of laws already enacted by this body, and when the causes which gave rise to the necessity for such assistance were not ones over which the citizens in the local area were responsible, but which

causes were the direct responsibility of a policy of our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the legislative committee having jurisdiction promptly consider this legislation. I respectfully submit that extensive hearings on this matter need not be held. The problem and the necessity are so obvious and so urgent that I respectfully request the chairman to grant priority consideration.

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT—A TRIBUTE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Eleanor Roosevelt's death last November came as a sorrowful shock to a world which had come to love and admire her.

There have been famous women known the world over for their profiles on coins of their images in light—

Wrote Archibald MacLeish—

but the world know Eleanor Roosevelt by heart.

Indeed, her life, from beginning to end, was a living testament to the universal ideal of human love and kindness. She became the living symbol of the hopes and aspirations of millions of people in all parts of the world because they knew that she cared about them and understood their condition.

From the very first days in the White House until the end of her gallant life, Eleanor Roosevelt was never interested in personal fame or glory. Rather, she used her position and influence as a springboard for service to others. She always welcomed every opportunity to turn injustice toward justice, inhumanity toward humane consideration, selfishness toward generosity. She was unafraid to speak out for causes she felt were deserving regardless of how unpopular they might be. She rose above petty criticisms from narrow minds to become a crusader for human betterment in every dark corner she looked into.

Eleanor Roosevelt's concern for human misery and deprivation came not from books but from person-to-person contact. She never hesitated to involve herself personally with the unpleasant scenes of humans suffering from hunger or disease. Her travels, first throughout the depression-ridden United States in the early New Deal days, and later in the war-torn areas of the world, strengthened her conviction that a peaceful world could never be achieved on a lasting basis without a greater understanding between peoples.

One curious thing—

Eleanor Roosevelt wrote in her autobiography—

is that I have always seen life personally; that is, my interest or sympathy or indignation is not aroused by an abstract cause

but by the plight of a single person whom I have seen with my own eyes. It was the sight of a child dying of hunger that made the tragedy of hunger become of such overriding importance to me. Out of my response to an individual develops an awareness of a problem to the community, then to the country, and finally to the world. In each case my feeling of obligation to do something has stemmed from one individual and then widened and become applied to a broader area.

One of the secrets of Eleanor Roosevelt's triumph as a great humanitarian was, I think, her deep faith in people and what people working together can accomplish for world peace.

No single individual—

She believed—

and no single group has an exclusive claim to the American dream. But we have all * * * a single vision of what it is, not merely as a hope and an aspiration but as a way of life, which we can come ever closer to attaining in its ideal form if we keep shining and unsullied our purpose and our belief in its essential value.

Eleanor Roosevelt's love and compassion for all humankind will always be an inspiration and the light of her life will never be extinguished.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 days, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. HEALEY (at the request of Mr. ROONEY), for Wednesday, March 13, 1963, on account of illness.

Mrs. KEE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPSCOMB, for 30 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. CRAMER, for 30 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 60 minutes, on March 20.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. STRATTON), for 60 minutes on March 14, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. STRATTON), for 60 minutes, on March 20.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. STRATTON), for 60 minutes, on March 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORTON.

Mr. PILLION.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. STRATTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PUCINSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

544. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

545. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the law relating to material and necessary witnesses to crimes committed in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

546. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report providing information on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental or research work for the 6-month period ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 950. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS:

H.R. 4815. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4816. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 4817. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4818. A bill to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4819. A bill to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for the taking of economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4820. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4821. A bill to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia; to provide for the election of the Delegate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4822. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 4823. A bill to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 4824. A bill to establish the Mount Rogers Wonderland in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 4825. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 4826. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 4827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily to haul unprocessed agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4828. A bill to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONTAÑA:

H.R. 4829. A bill to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall construct a 500-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4830. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to revise the rates of disability and death pension authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4831. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a special program for the construction, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of public eleemosynary hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4833. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of

California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 4834. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 4835. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4836. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 4837. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 4838. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4839. A bill for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4840. A bill to provide standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals used by departments and agencies of the United States or by recipients of grants or contracts from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4841. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad right-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4842. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meetings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 4843. A bill to provide standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals used by departments and agencies of the United States or by recipients of grants or contracts from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4844. A bill relating to the release of liability under bonds filed under section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain installment obligations transmitted at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 4845. A bill to create a commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of government; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 4846. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 4847. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that poliomyelitis developing a 10-percent degree of disability within 1 year from the date of discharge of any veteran shall be held and considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4850. A bill to repeal the commodities clause in part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4851. A bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 4852. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place certain natural amorphous graphite on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other educational expenses paid by him for the education of himself, his spouse, or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit schemes in interstate or foreign commerce to influence by bribery the outcome of sporting contests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 4856. A bill to provide for humane treatment of animals used in experiment and research by recipients of grants from the United States, and by agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4857. A bill to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations, upon consent of employee; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 326. Joint resolution providing for a study by the Veterans' Administration into the problems of veterans who are elderly, chronically ill, or otherwise handicapped; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 327. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day in each year as Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international

living museum of anthropology and ethnography; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 292. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4858. A bill for the relief of Andriana K. Anagnostopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Avelino Gomez Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 4860. A bill to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4861. A bill for the relief of David Dagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Kim Tricia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4863. A bill for the relief of Etsuko (Matsuo) McClellan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Sheila Marguerite Henderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 4865. A bill for the relief of Iren Almasi and Maria Almasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4866. A bill to provide for the advancement of Hospitalman Chief Gerald Henry White, U.S. Navy (retired) to the grade of chief warrant pharmacist; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4867. A bill for the relief of Sun Young Choy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4868. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chieko Takagi McKinstry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 4869. A bill for the relief of Eugene McVaugh and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4870. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Gardiner and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 4871. A bill for the relief of Glenn C. Deitz and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Emilio and Giulio Sibillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4873. A bill for the relief of Anthimos Halazonitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

68. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Clara V. Marshall and others, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to calling for the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congress Hoodwinked: The Billion-Dollar Boondoggle—U.S. Air Force and Atomic Energy Commission Waste \$1.04 Billion on Studies Before Junking Impractical Nuclear Airplane Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, in a period of 10 years from March 1951, to March 1961, the U.S. Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission were jointly engaged in feasibility and research studies aimed to produce a nuclear-powered airplane.

These Federal agencies wasted \$1,040 million up to the time of the cancellation of the project in March 1961. During this time, and in spite of the lavish expenditures, no usable airplane frame, engine, nuclear powerplant, or military weapons system was developed under the program.

The \$1,040 million expenditure is a total loss to the taxpayers of this country, except incidental theoretical knowledge with a minimal practical value. More tragic than this wastage of tax funds, is the fact that these funds represent a useless wastage of research, engineering, and technical talent and manpower. Research and engineering manpower to this extent had been diverted from projects that could have strengthened instead of weakened the relative military power of the United States to that of the Soviet.

During these 10 years, the emphasis, direction, and end purpose of this program had shifted and changed eight different times. The emphasis shifted from flight demonstration to applied research, to military weapons systems, to experimental no-flight program, to experimental flight program, to development for all-purpose military aircraft, to nuclear reactor shielding program, to research on nuclear reactor experiments.

During this whole period, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense had represented this project to the Congress as an urgent military weapons system. The Congress was misled and hoodwinked for 10 years concerning the actual purposes, the urgency, and the progress of this project.

After years of study, the Department of Defense, in another change of heart and mind, announced the specifications for this nebulous airplane to be: Speed, 400 to 600 miles per hour; altitude, 30,000 feet. At the same time, the United States already had the B-52 and the B-58 military bombers with the following capabilities: The B-52 with a speed of 600 miles per hour and an altitude of 35,000 feet; the B-58 with a speed of

1,300 miles per hour and an altitude of 50,000 feet.

For military purposes, this airplane was obsolete from the beginning to the end of the 10-year research project.

No military weapons system was ever seriously projected for this airplane by the Air Force, even if it could have been successfully developed and feasibly manufactured.

The General Accounting Office investigated, audited, and reported its findings on this fantastic nuclear airplane project. Comptroller General Joseph Campbell's recent report cited numerous deficiencies in purpose, direction, and management on the part of the military and atomic energy agencies which contributed to the astronomical costs and disappointing results.

The Comptroller General cited the following governmental management errors:

First. Various major facilities were constructed but never used for their intended purpose.

Second. Construction designs and plans were completed and paid for without ever being used.

Third. The Department of Defense failed to furnish timely direction and supervision of the contractors.

Fourth. The Department of Defense delayed for over 2 years in giving the Atomic Energy Commission a decision on a vital military aspect of the program.

Fifth. The Atomic Energy Commission extended a contract for producing yttrium oxide, 7 months beyond its need.

Sixth. A large negotiated contract was almost entirely subcontracted which pyramided overhead and profit costs for both prime contractor and subcontractor costs.

The prime contractors for the nuclear propulsion system were the General Electric Co. and Pratt & Whitney Division of the United Aircraft Corp.

General Electric was paid \$527,384,000 under its contracts. Pratt & Whitney received \$164,480,000.

The Comptroller General disclosed the following deficiencies and inefficiencies of the General Electric Co. under its contracts:

First. Ineffective equipment accountability;

Second. Physical inventories not taken regularly;

Third. Accumulation of stock outside storerooms;

Fourth. Uneconomical purchases;

Fifth. Deficiencies in accountability for certain inventories;

Sixth. Divided internal audit responsibility, thus precluding effective and comprehensive coverage of General Electric's nuclear airplane activities.

Seventh. Prompt corrective action not taken on internal audit findings;

Eighth. Accounting records did not segregate allowable and unallowable costs;

Ninth. Government audit services not utilized;

Tenth. Delay in suspending project;

Eleventh. Improper method for computing fixed fee.

The Comptroller General's review of operations of Pratt & Whitney Aircraft disclosed innumerable weaknesses in the financial and quantity controls over materials and supplies inventories, and a lack of formal accounting records to support the financial reports prepared by Pratt & Whitney.

GAO cited the following deficiencies in Pratt & Whitney's operations:

First. Physical inventories not taken regularly;

Second. Inadequate accountability for inventories;

Third. Stock records accessible to warehouse employees;

Fourth. Improper handling of requisitions;

Fifth. Absence of written procedures for inventories;

Sixth. Accumulation of excessive and obsolete inventories;

Seventh. Inadequate accounting records; and

Eighth. Prompt corrective action not taken on internal audit findings.

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General's revelation of this billion dollar boondoggle is a shocking example of the wastages that occur in our Federal system of administration. There are thousands of areas where sheer, clear wastages are going on.

There is no question in my mind that the 1964 budget could be reduced by from \$5 to \$10 billion by reasonable businesslike management in our executive and administrative agencies. This responsibility rests with the Chief Executive.

Congress cannot undertake to displace or to exercise detail supervision over the management and administrative responsibilities of the executive department.

Remarks of U.S. Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., to the Maryland Council of Farmer Cooperatives at Ellicott City, Md., on February 27, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Honorable CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland, at Ellicott City, Md., February 27, 1963:

REMARKS OF U.S. CONGRESSMAN CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS TO THE MARYLAND COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, ELICOTT CITY, MD., FEBRUARY 27, 1963

In my remarks here today I shall not stress my longstanding interest in, and support

of, agricultural cooperatives. And, I will not try to give you any advice on how to operate your cooperatives so that they will be of even greater service to your members, for I know you are more expert in this field than I am. Nonetheless, I do appreciate your inviting me to share with you some thoughts I have on the future of agriculture.

There is an erroneous idea that there is an inevitable conflict between the interests of farmers and those of consumers. This idea is expressed most frequently by those who think that the prices of farm products should be pushed by Government action of one kind or another. I would agree that there is a conflict between excessive Government intervention in agriculture and the long-run interests of consumers.

But if we take a close look at the real interests of consumers and farmers there is no conflict. The idea that there is a conflict is obsolete.

Consumers have an interest in maintaining the kind of an efficient, freewheeling, vigorous, and productive agriculture that has emerged in the United States and which Maryland agriculture so well exemplifies.

That this kind of agriculture serves the interests of consumers is evidence by the steady decline in the cost of buying an adequate diet.

In 1940 the average U.S. family spent 40 percent of its income for food. In 1961 the average U.S. family spent 19.7 percent of its income for food. In fact, if it bought the same kinds and quantities of food in 1961 that it bought in 1935-39, it would only spend 14 percent of its income for food.

Consumers have upgraded their diets. They are buying more meat, poultry, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables than they did 20 to 25 years ago. They are buying more convenience foods; foods ready to cook and eat.

U.S. consumers have more income left for education, medical care, housing and recreation because of the efficiency of American farmers.

It may not always appear that the benefits of this efficiency of production are shared in equitably by farmers themselves. But despite the growing pains of the agricultural revolution, the American farmer is a proud, independent, and stable part of the American scene. Agriculture is not sick, it's not prostrate, although it is changing. The net worth of farmers on an overall basis and on an average per capita basis continues to grow annually.

American farmers today are able to provide their children with education, with medical care, with an opportunity in life as never before.

Of all industries, agriculture has been clearly demonstrated to be that industry which does poorest, from the standpoint of both farmers and consumers, when central, political management is substituted for the incentives of a free economy.

The idea that Government must get involved commodity by commodity in planning production, in controlling production, marketing, and pricing of farm products, is an antiquated, inefficient, and dangerous approach to the future of farmers, and to the interests of consumers as well.

I like to be able to quote the President of the United States—he is everyone's President. He told a recent press conference that:

"The free market is a decentralized regulator of our economic system. The free market is not only a more efficient decision maker than the wisest central planning body, but even more important, the free market keeps economic power widely dispersed."

I could only applaud the sentiment. If he could only persuade some of those Harvard faculty members in the White House that teachers should listen and learn like the rest of us. In particular, I could wish that he would tell Secretary of Agriculture Freeman

of his rediscovery of the key economic principle that has made the American economy go.

I don't need to tell you about the impact of the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. But I do think I should take a minute to relate this to Government policy in the area of taxes and spending.

Farm costs, both production costs and the cost of marketing your products, continue to rise.

There is no mystery as to why this is so. Farm costs go up because of a variety of Government programs and policies.

Government spending is a major cost in all businesses and particularly in agriculture.

All Government expenditures must be paid for, either in taxes or in that most insidious of taxes, inflation.

Taxes go into the making of prices. Virtually every tax is eventually paid by the consumer of goods and services.

In a hundred hidden ways, taxes turn out to be costs and prices.

Every new or bigger spending program enacted by Congress means more costs, in taxes and in prices, to farmers and to other citizens.

Since farmers are the biggest consumers of goods and services on a per capita basis, they have a particularly heavy stake in Federal tax and spending programs. So anyone who tells you how much he loves farmers and how he wants to vote for things to help farmers, who then votes or works for a whole raft of new and bigger spending programs, is not really working for the interests of farmers. His concern for farmers' welfare is delusion and illusion, a lot of double-talk.

I am sure that you have a major interest in the European Common Market and how it is going to affect you as farmers and as marketers of farm products. This is a major subject in itself so let me make just one brief comment.

The European Common Market is a fact of life. It may turn out to be one of the crucially important developments of history. When we look at the ECM we can only wish it well and hope that it will mature as a strong economic force and military ally against Communist imperialism. But we must also be concerned with respect to the impact of the trading practices of this economic unit on U.S. farmers and other exporters. The recent import fees established on poultry illustrates the seriousness of the problem.

Section 252 of the trade bill enacted by the Congress was specifically designed to deal with this problem. It provides that whenever a foreign country maintains non-tariff trade restrictions or variable import fees which prevent the expansion of trade on a mutually advantageous basis, "the President shall . . . suspend, withdraw or prevent the application of benefits of trade agreements concessions to products of such country."

This is a tough policy. It was so intended by the Congress. It was intended as a means of giving our negotiators a means to prevent such harmful actions to U.S. farmers and other exporters as illustrated by the fence ECM has built around their poultry industry.

But this policy of the trade act is meaningless unless it is implemented. The Nation must look to the President and the State Department to implement the policy.

As yet, I have seen little indication that the policy will be forcefully and effectively implemented.

We must recognize that our Government has one major handicap in endeavoring to obtain acceptance of this policy by the ECM. This is our own Government farm policy.

The administration is busily engaged in preventing free market prices from functioning here in the United States. Consequent-

ly, when we insist that other countries should discard their protective policies we are negotiating from a position of weakness.

It is not exactly a strong bargaining position for us to tell others do as we tell you, not as we do.

It seems to me that Maryland agriculture has a great future. We have the advantages of an efficient agriculture and a nearness to the major markets of the United States.

It seems to me that this future will be best protected by building on the assets we have. These assets can be dissipated by centralized management of agricultural production and marketing which would curtail our efficiency and share our markets with areas less favored geographically.

In devising national policy relating to farm program we should copy success. With all its problems, those segments of U.S. agriculture which rely on the market as the major determinant of income and the major guide to investment, production and marketing, have a much more favorable outlook than those which have had the benefit of central planning and control.

A Tribute to the Honorable Clement J. Zablocki, Member of Congress From the Second District, Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my sincere pleasure to participate in a tribute to Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI sponsored by the Department of Wisconsin, Polish Legion of American Veterans, in Milwaukee, Wis.

I am sure my colleagues will be happy to learn of the very high regard that the people of Milwaukee and, indeed, of Wisconsin have for our colleague from the Second District in Wisconsin.

Throughout the evening, it was evident that those participating in this tribute recognized CLEM ZABLOCKI's impressive contribution as a Member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs toward helping carve an effective foreign policy for the United States.

It would be difficult to fully describe CLEM ZABLOCKI's impressive contribution toward a better understanding by all Americans of the serious problems with which the free world is faced in Berlin, in Laos, in Vietnam, in the Soviet Union, in Red China, and in Latin America.

CLEM ZABLOCKI's wise judgment and penetrating counsel have been woven deep throughout all the great decisions in the difficult field of foreign relations and international affairs made by our Nation in the past decade. I was happy to bring to the people of Wisconsin a picture of how thoroughly CLEM ZABLOCKI is respected here in Congress on both sides of the aisle and yes, Mr. Speaker, in both Chambers of the Congress of the United States.

His wise counsel and great dedication to the cause of freedom are a source of

inspiration to all of us here in Washington and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have dwelled on this particular subject at greater length to those participating in this great tribute to CLEM ZABLOCKI.

It was particularly fitting that Governor Reynolds, of Wisconsin, would personally participate in the tribute to CLEM. The Governor joined the others present in extolling the impressive record of accomplishment that CLEM ZABLOCKI brings, not only to the people of his congressional district in Wisconsin, but yes, Mr. Speaker, to all the people of America.

It was with a deep sense of pride that I observed during this tribute to CLEM the abiding sense of purpose in the American cause that CLEM ZABLOCKI brings to this Congress and to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ZABLOCKI was overwhelmed by the tribute paid him and the truly humble spirit of this great American was best reflected in his own remarks which concluded this very impressive banquet.

I should like to take this privilege to incorporate these remarks in the RECORD today because they so eloquently describe the greatness of our colleague from Wisconsin's Second Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ZABLOCKI's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF ACCEPTANCE BY HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI AT A TESTIMONIAL DINNER GIVEN IN HIS HONOR BY THE DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN, POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS, SUNDAY, MARCH 31, 1963

Congressman Pucinski, Governor Reynolds, Mr. Firmin, Mr. Borkowski, Commander Bieganski, Department Commander Nedwesi, Mrs. Wozniak, Mrs. Zalewski, Reverend Taterczynski, the Madrigal Singers of Alverno College, and friends, some of you may remember that recently there was an attempt to name a library for me. At the time, I said it didn't seem like a good idea since public buildings are usually named for deceased persons and I was not dead yet. Tonight I am not sure

whether I am really still alive. Sitting here and listening to these tributes is a little like attending one's own funeral.

Seriously, I am sincerely happy to be alive and here to receive this honorary membership citation in the Polish Legion of American Veterans. It is an honor which will be remembered and cherished always.

I only wish my wife could have been here tonight to share in these warm and wonderful proceedings. Unfortunately she could not be present.

This tribute you have paid is not, I know, purely a personal one. It is a tribute to the office I hold as Representative to the Congress of the United States, the most powerful lawmaking body on the face of the earth. It is my privilege to hold this post by the grace of God and the unstinting hard work of my family, friends, and acquaintances, many of them here tonight. I know you will forgive a personal privilege, if I single out my mother and present her to you. I attribute much to her for what I am.

To you, my friends, belongs the real praise, for you have aided me without thought of gain or personal privilege. You have trusted that I would represent you in the Halls of Congress as you would want to be represented, and I hope that I have not betrayed your trust.

I am proud to accept this tribute because to me it signifies in a true sense the basic purpose of the PLAV. Your organization's efforts to promote good citizenship and Americanism are well known.

You honor me not as one of Polish ancestry or solely for having assisted Poland in some way, but to inspire and encourage others to seek service in Government and participate in Government. And that is as it should be. For while we are proud of our national backgrounds, we are prouder still to be Americans, citizens of one of history's great nations.

Our American way of life presupposes a pluralism of racial, national and religious backgrounds. We have a country which is truly unified in its diversities. To my mind it would indeed be a tragic day for our country if all Americans conformed to the same customs, manners and culture. We are not meant to be poured out of one mold.

It is a pleasure and privilege for me to work with Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI in Congress, one of the most heterogeneous

groups in our Nation. Congressmen are of varied national backgrounds, hold varied political, philosophical and religious beliefs. They come from all parts of our Nation. The interchange of ideas and wisdom which takes place on Capitol Hill is in no small measure due to the diverse backgrounds of our national representatives.

We can be proud that our country is a melting pot; that each national group has made its contribution to our life and culture. But the process is far from over. There is still much that can be contributed to America by all of us who are interested in preserving for posterity the traditions and culture of our native lands.

As members of the PLAV you have chosen not only to preserve the heritage of America, and attend to the welfare of your fellow veterans and our way of life, but also the glories and triumphs of Poland. The latter you are conveying to your children, and sharing with those who might otherwise never know about them. In doing this you are promoting Americanism just as if you were once again fighting for the freedoms we hold so dear.

Further you are engaged in promoting a better understanding of the real image of Poland and the people of that great nation. Your organization is dedicated: to the restoration of individual human dignity to the unfortunate enslaved brethren; you are dedicated to the liberation of Poland from Communist domination and you are determined that Poland will return to the family of free nations where she rightfully belongs, for Poland has contributed much to the development and culture of the West.

I am confident your work and the efforts of all understanding citizens of this great country of ours will not be in vain.

As a Christian nation, soon to commemorate its millennium of Christendom, Poland will never succumb to the pressures and wiles of communism. Poland will be free. Her people will again rise and rejoice. Their voices will again glorify God in thanksgiving and in supplication that freedom shall be through all ages and forever theirs.

To this end not only your organization but all of us are committed. Ours is a great challenge. But our task is not insurmountable. May we be inspired with the zeal and dedication to fulfill our obligation.

In closing, may I again express my sincere gratitude to all of you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Joseph A. Baran, St. Michael's Church, Lansford, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Eternal God, by whose grace America is free and by whose inspiration we freely choose our government and, even during these highly crucial times, enjoy a flourishing of culture, spiritual creativity, and economic welfare, we beseech Thee, in Thy infinite goodness, to bless our President, our Congress, and the whole American people without regard to race, color, and creed.

Humbly we invoke Thee to look upon us mercifully as we daily pray for those countries of many millions of people which have contributed to the strength of America. Among these countries is Slovakia, a country in the heart of Europe, which today cannot freely com-

memorate the grand and significant anniversaries of its own glorious history. Slovakia cannot commemorate, in a manner that is fitting and just to glorify, O Lord in the highest, Thy greatness, the year 863 when the saintly brothers Cyril and Methodius, the messengers of the holy Christian mission, came into the territory of Slovakia to spread the gospel of truth in a language intelligible to the people of that country. Therefore, do we gratefully recall this great Slovak anniversary and thank Thee, Lord Almighty, Lord of the strong and the weak, Lord of the great and small nations, that Thou hast granted us the grace to live to see this happy day.

We are also happy to recall, in this House of Representatives, the 24th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Slovak nation by its duly elected representatives which happens to be this very day. Together with over 2 million Americans of Slovak descent we pray Thee, O merciful and just God, grant wisdom and courage to all free men and freedom-loving peoples,

so that they might lend a helping hand to this worthy, long-suffering Christian country of the Slovak Nation to regain its liberty and freedom.

May all human malice disappear, may the forces of good, of right, and justice tear asunder the curtain of iron and steel and, under Thy protection, O God of mercy, may America and Slovakia flourish to Thy greater honor and glory. In the name of our Lord, who liveth and reigneth for all eternity. Amen.

Let us remember in a silent prayer Congressman CLYDE DOYLE.

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.